

THE ECLECTIC REVIEW,

FOR OCTOBER, 1836.

- Art. I. 1. *Psalms and Hymns for Public Worship*, containing all the Psalms and Hymns of Dr. Watts, which are deemed valuable, together with a New Version of all the Psalms, and many original Hymns, besides a large Collection from other Writers. By William Allen, D.D., President of Bowdoin College; Author of the American Biography and Historical Dictionary. 18mo, pp. 690. Boston, U. S., 1835.
2. *Hymns Original and Select*, adapted to Public Worship. By John Bulwer. 18mo, pp. xviii. 474. London, 1835.
3. *A New Version of the Psalms of David*, in all the various Metres suited to Psalmody, divided into subjects and designated according to Bishop Horne. By E. Farr. 24mo, pp. 372. London, 1836.

ALAS for Dr. Watts! His volume of Psalms and Hymns, which for a century has been identified with our evangelical worship, which has formed our poetical liturgy, the companion of the Bible in our pews and our closets, and of which more copies have been circulated than of, probably, any other publication, except the Bible, within the same period,—this long venerated volume seems in imminent danger of being altogether swamped by the multitudinous attempts to improve upon his labours or to supply his deficiencies. The monopoly so long conceded to him, was first rudely and violently broken in upon by John Wesley, who at once gratified his polemical antipathies, and consulted the policy which he never lost sight of, in banishing the Calvinistic Psalmody from the chapels of his Connexion. Since then, it has been further invaded by the compilers of the numberless Appendices and Supplements with which, in most of our chapels, his volume has for many years held divided sway. A strong feeling has, indeed, set in against monopolies and prescriptive usages of all kinds; and it could not be expected that

churches enjoying freedom of worship and government should continue to confine themselves for ever to the compositions of Dr. Watts. At length, the plan of incorporating a selection only of Dr. Watts's Psalms and Hymns with the productions of other writers, is beginning to supersede, in many directions, the use of his volume in public worship; and in several of these Collections, the hymns being all anonymous, the name of the venerated Nonconformist is thus unfairly—we were going to say dishonestly—suppressed. But the injustice to his memory does not stop here. Not satisfied with setting aside his book, and expunging his name, our Hymn-compilers have, by their ruthless mutilations, done their worst to impair or destroy the identity of his compositions; so as to make it sometimes doubtful, whether it be the grosser wrong, to affix his name to the altered hymn, or to suppress it.

John Wesley set the example of those liberties; and yet, it is not a little amusing to notice how extremely annoyed he seems to have been by having similar freedoms taken with his own productions. 'Many gentlemen,' he says in the Preface to his Collection, 'have done my brother and me (though without naming us *) the honour to reprint many of our Hymns. Now they are perfectly welcome to do so, *provided they print them just as they are.* But I desire they would not attempt to mend them; for they really are not able. *None of them is able to mend either the sense or the verse.* Therefore I must beg of them one of these two favours: either to let them stand as they are, to take them for better or worse; or to add the true reading in the margin, or at the bottom of the page; that we may no longer be accountable either for the nonsense or the doggrel of other men.' Setting aside the arrogant tone of this complaint, we must concede that it was not unreasonable; but the Patriarch of Methodism had forgotten that, in this treatment, with what measure he had meted, it was but measured to him again.

We could have wished that what Wesley here claims for his own and his brother's compositions, had served as a general Notice to warn all trespassers upon other men's fair reputation, or at least to deter those from attempting to mend either the sense or the verse of Dr. Watts, who 'really are not able.' We do not mean to deny that many of Dr. Watts's hymns would be very greatly improved by slight and judicious alteration; and we think that the time is come, when a competently executed revision of his productions would be a service rendered to our Churches. But hitherto, the bungling attempts at amendment have been adapted to deter others from committing the like offence, rather than to encourage the hope of success.

* Just as he had acted towards Dr. Watts and many others.

These attempts have been carried further by American Editors, than among ourselves; and Dr. Allen, while he has, as we think, added another to the instances of complete failure, is quite alive to the faults into which his predecessors have fallen. Of Dr. Watts's *Psalms*, he has retained 114, which he has undertaken to present in a *revised* form. 'Perhaps, it may be asked,' he says (Preface), 'whether this labour has not been rendered unnecessary by editions of Watts, revised and abridged, which have been already published in this country? In answering this question, it is necessary to take a survey of what has been done in this respect.'

'In 1785, at the request of the General Association of Connecticut, Mr. JOEL BARLOW, who was afterwards known as ambassador to France, published an edition of Watts, containing versions of the 12 Psalms, omitted by Watts, with considerable alterations in 6 other Psalms, and various verbal changes. Some of these are imperfectly rhymed; and none of them have any peculiar excellence. The two best of them, the 88th and the 137th, are said to have been written by Dr. Hopkins. This work had 70 hymns annexed to it. There are omitted about thirty entire pieces of Watts, besides many stanzas. A few stanzas are interpolated, which WATTS never wrote, and changes are made much to the injury of the poetry. For instance the phrase, in 46th Psalm, in reference to a *stream*, "Our grief *al-lays*," is changed to "*supports* our faith;"—"Through all her palaces," in Ps. 48th, is changed to "How fair his heavenly grace;"—in Ps. 72, "barbarous nations" is changed to "western empires," and "leaps to loose his chains" to "bursts his chains;" in Ps. 94, "when will the *fools* be wise," the word "fools" to "*vain*;" in Ps. 145, "tottering days," descriptive of infancy, to "*sinking* days;" in Ps. 31, "how wondrous is thy grace" to the strange line, "how sweet thy smiling face!" But few changes are made for the sake of the rhyme; and the worst rhymes of WATTS are retained.

'Yet this is the edition of Watts, which in 1830 was adopted,—with eight or ten Psalms from Dwight and others,—by the General Assembly of the Presbyterian churches in this country. Were Barlow's new Psalms extremely beautiful and his alterations of Watts real improvements, there would still remain the unpleasant recollection, that the Presbyterian churches were indebted for their book of Christian songs to one, who died an unbeliever in the truth of the Christian religion.

'In 1795 Dr. BELKNAP published a selection of Psalms and Hymns from Watts, Tate, Doddridge, Mrs. Steele, &c. Though he altered Watts at pleasure, it was not with reference to the errors of the poetry or the improprieties of the rhyme.

'In 1800 Dr. DWIGHT published his edition of Watts,—in which he proposed to accommodate it to our republican institutions; also to versify what WATTS had omitted, and to enlarge the number of proper, or heroic metres. A writer in the Spirit of the Pilgrims has remarked on this work, "There is evidence enough, that it was no part of his

conception to improve the *lyric* character" of our psalms. Indeed his 10 versions in proper metre, most of them extending from 6 to 10 stanzas of 6 long lines each, are entirely unsuitable for public worship. His 18th Psalm has 60 hexameter lines.

' Besides retaining the bad rhymes of Watts, the following are some of the rhymes in the pieces, which are original; "arrayed, fed; showed, God; sway, free; beam, name; sin, decline; o'erthrown, runs; smiles, hills; power, cure; force, doors; prevail, tell; crew, now; presents, wants; will, smiles; moon, sun."

' Dr. SAMUEL WORCESTER was so aware of the imperfections of Dr. Watts's version, that in 1814 he abridged it, being persuaded that by an abridgement "redundancies would be retrenched and passages of little merit would be excluded." He omitted Parts and stanzas of Psalms and many Hymns; but there was no attempt to improve the passages, which were retained, and the work was not satisfactory to the public. Indeed some of Watts' pieces, which are deemed peculiarly excellent, were struck out. In 1819 Dr. Worcester published Watts *entire*, with all his faults, adding 237 select Hymns. In 1834 his son added 240 to these, making 474 Hymns. Arbitrary marks for musical expression were invented by Dr. W., being certain consonants, and vowels, not the established symbols, used in the books of music.

' In 1818 Rev. J. M. WINCHELL, a Baptist minister in Boston, published Watts *entire*, unaltered, except that the Psalms and Hymns are intermingled, being arranged promiscuously according to subjects. To this was added a selection of 327 Hymns, among which are nearly 80 of Watts's Hymns, from his Lyrics, &c., which Watts himself did not think worthy of being inserted in his Book for public worship. It is a sufficient objection to the plan of Mr. W. that the Psalms are too interesting and important, and too familiar to the reader, to allow their order to be broken up and destroyed.

' In 1832 the "Church Psalmody" was published at Boston, by Mr. L. MASON and Rev. D. GREENE, containing Select Psalms and Hymns, in number 1185; of which 421 are from Watts, omitting 300 of his pieces and many stanzas, so that on the whole about one half of Watts' book is omitted. There are added 150 pieces in the Psalms from Tate and Brady and twenty other writers. Except in a few instances there is no attempt to correct the bad rhymes of WATTS or of other writers, as may be concluded from the following pairs of words, designed to rhyme together:—"secure, more; peace, days; feet, straight; laws, foes; joy, day; thoughts, faults; deserts, hearts; light, wait; those, laws; commands, chains; heart, guard; stars, years; seeks, breaks; theme, Lamb; endured, Lord; earth, breath; condescend, stand; declares, heir; change, strains; man, concern; God, thought; far, appear; glory, adore thee; unheard, barred; station, compassion; exert, heart; hour, secure;" and hundreds of others but little more harmonious.

' This work, by a misnomer, is entitled "Psalmody," which word implies actual singing, and not merely a book of odes. It is understood, that it was chiefly compiled by Mr. Mason, an eminent professor of music; and the alterations, made in the Psalms and

Hymns, seem to be made, not for the improvement of the poetry, but in fact in many instances to its defacement, for the sake of accommodating the lines to the *music*. But the sentiment, and the beauty of poetry should never be sacrificed to the tune. It is easy to prepare Hymns with a dull, weary uniformity of accent, like the fall of a hammer or the beat of a drum; and this may accommodate the singers, and perhaps may be pleasing, so far as the mere music is concerned. But surely sense is superior to sound; and there is a beauty in poetry, which cannot exist without ease and variety.' pp. xxi.—xxiii.

The instances which Dr. Allen proceeds to adduce, of 'injurious changes' in Watts's hymns, amply prove the absence of either correct taste or sound judgement in the writers. Before we give a specimen or two of Dr. Allen's improvements, it will be proper to give the justification which he offers for the liberties he has taken.

'He must confess, that, from a reluctance to alter the lines of Watts, which are recorded in the hearts of Christians, he has retained many of his questionable but more tolerable rhymes,—such as would hardly be allowable in a modern writer. He has in fact, from this cause, abandoned many alterations, which he had made in Watts, and preserved his lines, as far as possible, unaltered.

'For the changes made he deems no apology necessary. Dr. Watts's Hymns were published in 1707. The next year, in preparing a second edition, he requested a friend to point out to him "those lines which are offensive to the weak and pious, shocking and disgusting to the polite, or obscure to the vulgar capacity." He accordingly added a hundred and fifty new Hymns, and altered nearly "half a hundred lines." He says, "Some that were less offensive, were let pass; for the bookseller desired I would not change too much." About this time he sold his copyright; and this circumstance, though he lived forty years afterwards, deprived him of the power of amending and improving his own Hymns. He said in his old age to Mr. Grove, who suggested a particular change, "that he should be glad to do it, but it was out of his power; for he had parted with the copyright and the bookseller would not suffer any such alteration." It must be a strange prejudice, which Dr. Watts would have condemned, that, after the lapse of 128 years, deems his Hymns too perfect or too sacred to be altered.

'A deceased friend has said, that in Dr. Watts' book "are hundreds of verses, which he would readily part with;" notwithstanding this, he would retain the whole, unabridged, unaltered,—all that is repugnant to the sense of propriety and the refined taste of the present age,—all that is barbarous in poetry and unfit to be sung,—because he could not trust any person "to cross and blot for him." If, however, the memory of Watts and the claims of devotion require the thing to be done, some one must do it; and he who should do the work with tolerable skill, may be regarded as having done a public service. Nor does such a work seem to require "a greater lyric poet than Watts himself." pp. xxviii, xxix.

Perhaps not, but it requires at least a portion of his genius and

a sympathy with his poetic and devout feeling, together with a more pure and modern taste. Now we cannot detect any strong indication of these qualities in the following specimen of revision.

- ‘ Blest are the souls, who hear and know
The gospel’s joyful sound ;
Peace shall attend the paths they go,
And light their steps surround ;
- ‘ Pure is the joy their spirits drink
Through their Redeemer’s name ;
Nor can their rock-built hope e’er sink,
O’erwhelming them with shame.
- ‘ The Lord our confidence sustains,—
He strength and glory gives ;
Israel ! thy King for ever reigns,
Thy God for ever lives !’

It is true, that, in the original, the rhymes are faulty ; but Dr. Allen admits this to be an insufficient reason for introducing such free alterations in compositions so well known and consecrated by religious feeling, as the psalms and hymns of Dr. Watts. ‘ He has,’ he says, ‘ from this cause, abandoned many ‘ alterations which he had made in Watts, and preserved his ‘ lines as far as possible, unaltered.’ It is a pity that he had not adhered to this wise determination in the above and other instances. We agree with him, that imperfect rhymes, which offend the ear more than the absence of rhyme, (for the latter only disappoints it,) are a great fault in a hymn ; so great a fault, as to justify the rejection of any modern composition not rising above mediocrity, and the alteration of such hymns as may be deemed worthy of preservation, if they have not become too much familiarized to the ears and hearts of pious Christians to render it expedient. But the attempt to make the compositions of Dr. Watts bend to the rigid laws of modern versification, in regard to rhyme, would be like white-washing oak carving,—a sacrilege against taste. We have to adduce a still more flagrant instance of bad taste in the treatment which Dr. Watts’s noble Psalm,

‘ Our God, our help in ages past ’—

receives at his hands. It is not altered, indeed, but it is barbarously mutilated, being cut down to *four* stanzas ; and among those which are omitted is the fine verse,

- ‘ Before the hills in order stood,
Or earth received her frame,
From everlasting thou art God,
To endless years the same.’

We shall give without comment two more specimens of what we deem most injudicious and tasteless alteration ; the only object being, apparently, to mend the rhymes.

PSALM XCIX.

- ‘ Exalt the Lord and bless,
And worship at his feet ;
His nature is all holiness,
And mercy is his seat.
- ‘ When Israel was his choice,
When Aaron served Him there,
When Moses rais’d his earnest voice,
He check’d his people’s fear.
- ‘ Oft he forgave their guilt,
Nor would destroy their race ;
And oft He made His vengeance felt,
When they abus’d his grace.
- ‘ Exalt the Lord our God,
Whose grace is still the same ;
He still doth hold a righteous rod,
He’s jealous of his name.’

PSALM CIII.

- ‘ Bless, O my soul, the Lord ;
Let all within me join,
His mercies grateful to record,
Whose favours are divine !
- ‘ The Lord extol and bless,
Nor let his mercies lie
Forgotten in unthankfulness
And without praises die.
- ‘ He gives the conscience peace ;
’T is He relieves thy pain,
’T is He, who heals thy strong disease,
And makes thee young again.
- ‘ His wondrous works and ways
He made by Moses known ;
But sent the world his truth and grace
By his beloved Son.
- ‘ Bless, O my soul, the Lord ;
Let all within me join,
His mercies grateful to record,
Whose favours are divine !’

In revising the Hymns introduced into the second Part of the Collection, Dr. Allen has indulged to a still greater extent the license of revision, with no better success. What, for instance, can be more inane than the alteration introduced in the following line?—

‘Thou art my morning star *most clear*.’

Or again, take the last verse of Hymn 125 of B. I., which is thus given :

‘By humble faith then let us seek
His mercy and his power :
We shall obtain, however weak,
Grace in the trying hour.’

But we must proceed to give a specimen or two of Dr. Allen’s original hymns. The following version of Psalm xcii. is, we are bound to say, one of the very worst.

- ‘T is good to give thanks to God in the sky,
‘T is good to extol thy name, O most High,
To show forth thy kindness with each morning’s light,
Thy faithfulness too with the dark coming night :
- ‘Tis good on the ten-stringed harp and guitar
To sound forth, O Lord, thy praises afar ;
For Thou, by thy work, dost now make me rejoice,
And I will exult with my heart and my voice.
- ‘How great and how wondrous, Lord, are thy works ?
Thy counsel, how deep in darkness it lurks ?
The brutish do not thy designs understand,
Nor fools e’er acknowledge thy all-swaying hand.
- ‘When wicked men spring and flourish as grass,
As quickly they fade and from the earth pass ;
But Thou, O Jehovah, abidest for e’er,
And Thou to the good man wilt always be near.
- ‘The righteous do grow, as palm tree uprears,
They flourish like cedar, Lebanon bears ;
In house of the Lord they are planted and grow,
Their flourishing state all, that see them, may know.
- ‘They still do shoot forth, though far gone in years,
With greenness of leaf ;—their fruit too appears ;
To show, that Jehovah is good and upright,
With him is no darkness, but all is pure light !’

We will now try to fix upon one of the best.

PSALM C.

- ‘ Come, and make a joyful noise,
All ye lands, to Christ the King!
Come, with gladness lift your voice,
And before his presence sing:
He hath made us by his might;
We are his by ev’ry right!
- ‘ Come into his gates with praise;
Offer thanks unto his name;
Songs in grateful wonder raise,
All his saving works proclaim;
Great his mercy, as his power!
Firm his truth for evermore!’

The spirit of the Psalm is here happily preserved, and the versification is easy and melodious. Our next specimen is from the Hymns.

‘ *The Widow’s Son raised.* Luke 7.

- ‘ No revellers are here,
Thus moving sad and slow;—
A widow’s son is on the bier,
And tears of anguish flow.
- ‘ Why stops the moving crowd?
The Son of God commands;
“ Young man, arise!” He cries aloud;
The dead man lifts his hands!
- ‘ What ecstasy was thine,
O widow, blest once more,
To hear that mighty voice divine,
And see its wondrous power?
- ‘ And thus, another day,
That voice will reach the dead,—
The myriads slumb’ring in the clay,—
And life and rapture spread!’

We shall make room for two or three more, which, we think, will please.

‘ *Missionary Hymn.*

- ‘ Wise men have measur’d mountains,
And fathom’d depths of seas,
Have trac’d the hidden fountains,
And search’d deep mysteries;
But they have fail’d to measure
What most might blessings prove,
And fail’d to find the treasure
Of Christ’s most wondrous love.

‘ But sure no rock-crown’d mountain
 So lofty lifts its head,
 And from no welling fountain
 Such joys are widely spread :—
 The love of Christ, transcending
 Yon heaven’s exalted height,
 Is flowing love,—ne’er ending,—
 In God’s own glorious light !’

‘ Prayer to Christ.

‘ Jesus ! Thou dost reign above,
 And Thou shalt reign below ;
 Nought thy kingdom firm shall move,
 Thy purpose overthrow :
 All the earth thy light shall see,
 All the earth shall praise thy power ;
 Lord, thy glorious majesty
 Let heaven and earth adore !

‘ Jesus, Saviour ! make us thine,
 And stamp thine image here ;
 Grant us, Lord, thy grace divine, —
 With thy sweet mercy cheer.
 Thou hast ransom’d us from hell,
 Thou hast sav’d us by thy blood ;
 O, that we in heav’n may dwell,
 To praise Thee with the good !’

‘ Prayer to Christ for mercy.

‘ Jesus ! save me, or I perish !
 Guilt weighs heavy on my heart :
 Fled the hopes I once did cherish,
 All delusions now depart.

‘ Shall I trust in tales of error ?
 Shall I deem the danger slight ?
 Ah, what scenes of fear and terror
 When eternal truth shines bright ?

‘ I am lost, but Thou canst save me ;
 Save me, Lord, for thine own sake !
 In atoning blood now lave me ;
 Of thy love let me partake !

‘ Fled the hopes I once did cherish,
 All delusions now depart :
 Jesus ! save me, or I perish !
 Jesus ! cheer my broken heart !’

Mr. Bulmer was led to undertake the compilation of his hymn-book by the settled conviction, that but few of the psalms and

hymns in common use are adapted to public worship. He thinks Dr. Urwick not far from the truth, when he says of Watts, that probably not more than a fourth part of his psalms and hymns are eligible for this purpose. But the principles which he lays down have required not only the exclusion of three-fourths of Dr. Watts's compositions, but the mutilation of the greater part of the remainder. First, he conceives it to be improper, in hymns designed for public worship, to use the present tense for the imperfect, or to represent past events as now taking place; as in the hymn :

‘ Hark the glad sound, the Saviour comes.’

Next, he objects to the use of apostrophe, whether to saints and angels, or to nations and lands. Thirdly, (and in this we cordially join with him,) he deprecates the use of compositions paraphrasing the words spoken by the Almighty, (as in Psalm LXXXI, and Hymns XLV, LXXXIV, LXXXVII, and CXXVII, of Book I). Further, ‘how unsuitable,’ he remarks, ‘for a mixed congregation, are hymns expressive of such attainments in Christian experience, such spirituality of mind, and deadness to the world, as, perhaps, no one present is conscious of.’ Finally, he objects to the use, in public worship, of that large proportion of the compositions in most hymn-books, which ‘are mere essays in rhyme, consisting of declarations of doctrine and experience, or exhortations to saints and sinners,’ all which he considers as unsuitable. ‘Hymns addressed to God, consisting of adoration, prayer, praise, and thanksgiving, are,’ he contends, ‘the only ones proper for public worship. Compositions under that name, addressed to saints and sinners, seem to rob God of his glory, by converting that which ought to be eminently an act of worship, into preaching and exhortation.’ ‘Instead of being able to say, “*Praise* waiteth for thee, O God, in Zion”, how often may it be said with much more propriety, “*Complaining, reproving, exhorting, and teaching, wait for thee; and these we substitute for praise!*”

In following out these notions of the reformation which is desirable in our psalmody, Mr. Bulmer has carried his alterations to an extent which he will find few persons to approve. The Psalms of David would themselves require to be remodelled, in order to satisfy his rigorous and arbitrary rules. He admits, that ‘we may certainly praise God, by speaking *of* him, as well as *to* him,’ but contends for the latter as ‘the usual and proper way of doing it in acts of worship.’ Instead, therefore, of saying, “The Lord is my shepherd”, “God is our refuge and strength”, he would have had the Psalmist say, “Thou, Lord, art my shepherd”,—“Thou, God, art my refuge.” At least, he will

not allow us to sing the versions of those noble Psalms, till he has transposed them in the manner following.

PSALM XXIII.

- Thou art my Shepherd, gracious Lord,
By whom my wants are well supplied ;
Thy providence and holy word
Are still my safety and my guide.
- In pastures where salvation grows
'Tis mine to feed, 'tis mine to rest ;
I drink the living stream that flows,
And walk with those whom thou hast blest.
- When blindly I thy ways mistake,
Thou dost restore my soul to peace,
And lead me, for thy mercy's sake,
In paths of truth and righteousness.
- When call'd to pass the gloomy vale
Where death and all its terrors are,
My heart and hope shall never fail,
For thou wilt not forsake me there.
- Amidst the darkness and the deeps,
Thou wilt thy tender care display ;
Thy staff shall then support my steps,
Thy rod direct my doubtful way.
- How truly do thy mercies, Lord,
Attend thy people all their days !
O help me now to hear thy word,
And tune my heart to sing thy praise !

Now, with all respect for Mr. Bulmer's excellent intentions, we must condemn such liberties as he has here taken with Dr. Watts, as alike unnecessary and unwarrantable. The beauty and propriety of the Psalm, as well as its conformity to the original, are materially diminished by the alterations, which are made upon a false principle. Mr. Bulmer is altogether erroneous in maintaining, that adoration, praise, and thanksgiving require to be presented in the form of an address to the Object of worship. Scriptural usage, and the very notion implied in celebrating the praises of God, sufficiently disprove his gratuitous position. "Worthy is the Lamb that was slain",—"Alleluia! for the Lord God Omnipotent reigneth"—are the strains in which the heavenly worshippers adore Him that sitteth on the throne. "To give thanks unto the Lord", and to "speak good of his name", are equally to praise Him. And in compositions designed for choral or congregational use, the mode which Mr. Bulmer deems unsuitable for public worship, is that which we cannot but deem ordi-

narily preferable, the very design of singing the praises of God requiring such expatiation upon the topics adapted to inspire devotional sentiment, as is unsuitable in direct addresses to the Deity. In the compositions of the inspired Psalmist, no feature is more beautiful than the interchange of the two modes of celebrating the Divine perfections, the direct and the indirect, and the transition from the expression of devout meditation to ejaculations of praise or prayer. In many of the didactic Psalms, the train of reflection is wound up with an emphatic burst of devout feeling, which renders them eminently adapted to the purposes of public worship. That there is far too little of the genuine spirit of the Psalms, which is the spirit of praise, in a large proportion of our hymns in common use, we freely admit; but surely the mode of phraseology is a matter of small importance. Indeed, there may be, in hymns directly addressed to God, and ostensibly hymns of praise, much more of preaching and sentimentalizing than in other hymns of a more mixed or didactic character. As we may praise God by speaking of Him, so we may be speaking to Him without either worshipping or praying to him, and the *matter* of our addresses to God may be such as is more suitable for preaching or exhortation. There are many hymns in Mr. Bulmer's collection, which we should deem more appropriate, if they were not thrown into the form of direct addresses to the Deity.

To advert to Mr. Bulmer's other rules; we cannot agree with him, that the use of the present tense in speaking of past transactions, which is common to all languages, and is a figure as readily understood by barbarous nations as by the most polished,—can either mislead, or be justly represented as 'not agreeable to truth.' At the same time, it may not unfrequently have been had recourse to without propriety, as well as the use of apostrophe, in compositions not of that elevated strain to which such bold figures are appropriate. Apostrophes to inanimate nature, however, or to abstractions,—calls upon lands and nations, and addresses expressive of a devout wish,—are not open to the objection which may apply to the apparent invocation of angelic beings or departed spirits. And there is a wide and obvious distinction between apostrophizing angels as fellow-worshippers, (for which we have the precedent and sanction of the inspired Psalmist,) and invoking their intercession or aid, which is trespassing on forbidden ground, and running into the language of idolatry. In Mr. Bulmer's objections to rhyming declarations of doctrine and experience, and exhortations to saints and sinners, we so far coincide, that, although we do not desire to see them excluded altogether from our hymn-books, we yet cannot but deprecate their forming so undue a proportion of our hymns, while, for the most part, their unsuitableness to public worship is not redeemed by any poetical merit or intrinsic excellence. We need only name a

few hymns, however, which come under this class, to shew that Mr. Bulmer's rule of exclusion would deprive the Church of the use of some of the most edifying and heart-soothing effusions of genius and pious experience, such as are equally adapted for private and congregational use: for example, Cowper's noble hymn, 'God moves in a mysterious way'; the beautiful Moravian hymn, 'Give to the winds thy fears'; 'Go to dark Gethsemane'; 'Begone, unbelief'; and several of a similar character.

Mr. Bulmer's volume, then, we are compelled to say, has been compiled upon principles which must preclude its being generally acceptable. His alterations are objectionable, both in point of taste, and as exceeding the utmost license that can be deemed allowable; and he has excluded a large class of hymns which our churches will not be willing to lose. Nor can we praise his arrangement. The Volume is divided into three books, comprising, 1. Hymns suitable for the introductory part of Divine service; 2. Hymns proper to be sung before sermon; 3. Hymns proper to be sung after sermon. Each of these books has its separate numeration, which is injudicious. Book I. comprises 208 hymns, in four sections, headed: Sunday Morning, Sunday Afternoon, Sunday Evening, and Lecture Evening. Book II. contains 228 hymns, arranged under the heads, 'Serious, Impressive, or Awakening subjects; Encouraging or Cheerful subjects; Edifying, Argumentative, or Explanatory subjects; Occasional subjects.' Book III. contains 236 hymns on 'Doctrinal', 'Practical', 'Experimental', and 'Occasional subjects.' Such an arrangement as this is of course purely arbitrary, as the hymns which occur in one book might, for the most part, with equal propriety, have been placed in another. Those given under the head of 'Lecture Evening', for instance, are fitted for various occasions, and many of them for the services of the Lord's Day. Of the 672 hymns, the greater part are either original, or so materially altered as to be, in great measure, new. The originals are of extremely unequal merit; but many of them are very pleasing, and will be acceptable to our congregations; and though we cannot praise the execution of the volume as a whole, for the reasons already assigned, we can cordially recommend it to perusal for the spirit of devotion which pervades it, and which will render it a profitable help to the meditations of the closet.

The first hymn in the collection is 'on the example of the Puritans and Nonconformists in keeping holy the Lord's Day.'

'To Thee, in ages past,
 Our pious fathers came;
 On Thee, O, Lord, their cares they cast,
 Nor were they put to shame.

Our
secti
'de

‘Thy Holy Day they lov’d ;
They us’d the means of grace ;
And oft thy faithfulness they prov’d,
When they had sought thy face.

‘ Their faith in Thee was strong ;
Their godliness was pure ;
And while thou wast their strength and song,
They all things could endure.

‘ Their steps may we pursue,
As they obey’d their Lord ;
So may our hearts and lives be new,
And with thy will accord !

‘ O be Thou with us here,
And thy rich grace display ;
For our salvation, Lord, appear
On this thy hallow’d day !’ pp. 1, 2.

Our next specimen of the Original Hymns is also taken from the section for ‘ Sunday Morning,’ and is entitled ‘ Praise for Re-deeming Grace.’

‘ Lord of the vast creation,
Support of worlds unknown,
Desire of ev’ry nation,
Behold us at thy throne :
We come for mercy crying,
Through thine atoning blood ;
And, on thy grace relying,
We seek each promis’d good.

‘ We bless that condescension
Which brought thee down to earth,
Of which the Seers made mention,
Who prophesied thy birth.
We celebrate the glory
Which mark’d thy wondrous way,
And own the joyful story
Which claims this hallow’d Day.

‘ O when shall thy salvation
Be known through ev’ry land,
And men in ev’ry station
Obey thy great command !
In God’s own Son believing,
From sin may they be free ;
And, gospel-grace receiving,
Find life and peace in Thee !

‘ O meet us, blessed Saviour ;
 Let thy free grace abound ;
 And then shall our behaviour
 Proclaim the mercy found.
 Array’d in thine own beauty,
 May each accepted be,
 And all our Sabbath-duty
 Be sanctified through Thee !’ pp. 32, 33.

The following hymn for a Missionary service, founded on Psalm ii. 9—12, occurs in Book II. § 4, on ‘ occasional subjects.’

‘ Immortal King of kings,
 And Lord of all below,
 To Thee alone, in heav’nly things,
 Mankind obedience owe.

‘ May princes well discern
 The homage due to Thee ;
 And all the rights of conscience learn,
 While they protect the free.

‘ Thus cause them to befriend
 The gospel of thy grace,
 Until thy government extend
 To all the human race.

‘ What favours wilt thou give
 To those who own thy sway ;
 In peace and honour shall they live,
 And prosper in their day.

‘ Thus all the nations bless,
 And bring the strangers nigh ;
 Let ev’ry realm thy name confess,
 And sound thy praises high.’ p. 306.

We can insert only one more, and we are induced to select a funeral hymn, not merely on account of its intrinsic recommendations, but because it is remarkable that we have scarcely any hymns adapted for funereal services, which are either in the form, or breathe the spirit of prayer, being for the most part sentimental meditations or elegiac complaints.

‘ Dear Saviour, thou hast said of those
 Who still believe and hope in Thee,
 That they in peace this life shall close,
 And death shall never, never see ;
 For thou wilt make the foe their friend,
 And bless them in their latter end.

‘ When absent from the house of clay,
Their happy spirits are with Thee :
They gladly wait for that bless’d day,
When full redemption they shall see ;
When thou their sleeping dust wilt own,
And make their bodies like thine own.

‘ Thou art the life of all thy saints,
And thou their resurrection too.
Revive our spirit when it faints,
And all our lively hopes renew :
On thine own word may we rely,
That true believers never die !’

We have been anxious to do justice to Mr. Bulmer, because we think that he has deserved well of the religious community ; and we are disposed to address him in Scripture language, “ Thou didst well that it was in thine heart ; nevertheless ”—the reformation of our psalmody is reserved for other hands. We shall now advert to a few of the numerous attempts previously made to compile a volume of Hymns for Congregational use.

Of those that include a selection from the Psalms and Hymns of Dr. Watts, by far the best, in our judgement, is the one edited by Dr. H. F. Burder, first published in 1826 *, and comprising 600 Hymns. Of these, 313 are from Watts. In very few cases, any alteration is made in the language of the hymns selected, but entire verses are omitted in numerous instances, with which no fault can be found. That Dr. Burder’s selection has not been more extensively adopted, has been owing partly, we apprehend, to its being a *premature* attempt to supplant the use of Dr. Watts’s Psalms and Hymns in their entire and separate form, and partly to its not including a sufficient variety from other authors for all occasions. The Rev. Mr. Shepherd, Minister of Ranelagh Chapel, had, some years before, published for the use of his congregation a Hymn-book including the majority of Watts’s Psalms and Hymns, with a selection from other writers and some originals ; but its use has been confined, we believe, very nearly to the circle of the Editor’s friends. The chief faults are, the admission of too large a number of hymns of inferior merit, and the suppression of the authors’ names. We have referred, above, to Dr. Urwick’s Collection, printed at Dublin in 1829. In this also, the plan of incorporating a selection from Watts with the compositions of other writers has been adopted, the names of the authors being in like manner improperly and injudiciously suppressed ; while great liberties are

* See Eclectic Review, 2d Series, vol. xxv. p. 470.

taken in altering the phraseology. We must offer a few remarks upon each of these points.

As to the suppression of the authors' names, whatever excuse may be alleged, or howsoever immaterial in itself may be regarded the circumstance by whom a hymn is written, it is a practice unjust alike to the fair literary rights of the living, and to the memory of the sainted dead. It is not so much to be wondered at, that the Compilers of collections for the Use of Episcopal churches and chapels, should deem it expedient to conceal how largely they had drawn from the *Psalms and Hymns* of the eminent Nonconformist, Watts. But that any Dissenting Editors should have followed such a precedent, we can ascribe only to inconsideration. The result, whatever be the motive, is the same. If Dr. Urwick's Collection, or Mr. Shepherd's Collection, or any other compiled upon the same principle, were to come into general use, the name of Dr. Watts would be completely suppressed and consigned to oblivion. The Inventor of our Psalmody, as he has been styled, whose praise has so long been in our churches, would be superseded by the Dr. A., or Mr. B., who had performed the cheap labour of editing a mere compilation. The best feelings of the heart resent this sacrilegious injustice to the memory of the dead. But, if the suppression of Dr. Watts's name would involve the highest degree of ingratitude, the injustice would scarcely be less, of concealing our obligations to writers of other communions,—such as the Wesleys, Cowper, Newton, Toplady, Bishop Ken, and Bishop Heber. The bigotry which would take offence at such names, or reject the compositions of Christians of other denominations, if it lurk within any Dissenting communion, ought not to be stooped to or deceived by so mean and cowardly an expedient. Wesleyan bigotry has, we make no doubt, been greatly fostered by the sectarian hymn-book, in which no name of any author but the great Apostle of Methodism is suffered to appear. To a devout Christian of catholic spirit, the circumstance is cheering and delightful, that the different sections of the Church, notwithstanding their ecclesiastical divisions and feuds, can still maintain a common language in their psalmody, and that poets of different communions have furnished contributions to the common metrical liturgy. This pleasing evidence of the essential oneness of true religion ought to be broadly stamped upon our Hymn-books; and nothing would so powerfully tend to reconcile us to the discontinued use of Watts's *Psalms and Hymns* in its separate form, as its being superseded by a Collection bearing this stamp of catholicity, and exhibiting in an imperishable wreath the venerated names of those saintly men whose genius and piety are the common property of the Church.

There remains the consideration, that the suppression of the

names, is, in regard to living authors, a fraudulent infringement upon literary property, and an act of gross injustice. A mere general acknowledgement of obligation in the Preface, is no compensation for robbing an author of any portion of his fairly earned fame, and alienating any of his productions from his literary property*. It may not be advisable to obtrude the name of the author of each hymn in the pages of the work, but the Index ought to shew from what source, so far as discoverable, every hymn has been taken.

The only plausible apology for the injustice of suppressing the authors' names, founds itself on the alterations introduced in their compositions. This excuse is disposed of by the remark, that when the alterations are material, it is very easy, and very proper, to designate the hymn in this manner:—'Altered from Watts'—'Altered from Doddridge'—Or, 'Watts altered,' &c. Dr. Urwick says, that, 'had the names of authors been affixed to the compositions thus altered, he would have pleaded guilty of dishonest dealing towards the character of others. As the Collection stands, the Compiler alone is responsible for its demerits.' We admit that to give a mutilated hymn or poem as the genuine composition of the author is dishonest and unfair; but it is still grosser unfairness, not to acknowledge both the fact of the original authorship and that of the alteration.

It is singular enough that the very excuse that Dr. Urwick assigns for omitting the names of authors, is, by Mr. Bickersteth, with great propriety used as a reason for giving them. In the Preface to his "*Christian Psalmody*" (London, 1833), certainly one of the very best Collections in all respects that has ever appeared, Mr. Bickersteth says:—

'Considerable hesitation was felt in giving the names of the authors of the hymns; partly from the desire that the one name of Christ should only be known; partly from the fear that it might be a hindrance to devotional feeling, to find a name attached as author to a hymn, with which prejudice was either justly or unjustly connected, and partly as alterations have been sometimes made in the hymns, which would lead the author to disown them.

'But while the name of Jesus is alone to be exalted, he bears the names of his people on his breast, and they are graven on the palms of his hands. It was to the Compiler peculiarly delightful to bring

* Mr. Montgomery has declared, that he 'would rather be the anonymous author of a few hymns which should become an imperishable inheritance to the people of God, than bequeath another epic poem to the world, which should rank his name with Homer, Virgil, or our greater Milton.' A noble sentiment, worthy of the man; but Mr. M. does not say, and could not mean, that he would prefer to have been unknown by name as a hymn writer.

together so many names of the followers of Christ, of varied ages, denominations, powers, and rank, all combined in accomplishing one blessed result, the exaltation of the one God and Father of all, the one Lord and Saviour, and the one Spirit the Comforter, and to furnish the one Church bought with the blood of Christ, with an earthly help to the sweetest earthly, or rather heavenly, employment of the Church here below. The prejudice to which allusion has been made, if just, need not interfere with our profit in the use of a hymn truly valuable in itself; and if unjust, the sooner it is dispelled the better, and may the hymns here given help to dispel all such prejudices. As alterations have been made probably by every collector of hymns, the only effective way of enabling the reader to know what the hymn originally was, is to give the name of the author, by which reference may be made to it as first written.'—p. iv.

Dr. Urwick proceeds to urge in vindication of the changes introduced, the law of precedent. 'To give some idea of the extent to which the practice of altering hymns has been carried, he would state, that, on referring to twelve different volumes containing a popular hymn, he found ten variations in the reading of the first verse. Besides, his object has been to provide a manual for congregational psalmody, and he therefore felt warranted to introduce whatever modifications appeared desirable to render compositions better fitted for the purpose.' Hymns requiring such modifications are rarely suitable, or capable of being rendered fit for congregational use, as might be amply shewn from Dr. Urwick's unsuccessful experiments. He seems to have thought it quite sufficient to change the singular form into the plural, in order to render a hymn written for the closet, and suitable only for private use, fit for public worship. In his Collection, 'all the hymns are in the plural number'; and here is a specimen of the effect of this alteration.

'Jesus, lover of *our* souls,
We to thee for safety fly,
 While the ocean round *us* rolls,
 While the tempest still is high:
 Hide *us*, O *our* Saviour, hide,
 Till the storm of life is past:
 Safe into the haven guide,
 O receive *our* souls at last.

'Other refuge have *we* none;
All our hopes depend on thee.
 Leave, oh! leave *us* not alone;
 Still *our* strength and comfort be.
 All *our* trust on thee is stayed;
 All *our* help from thee we bring.
 Cover *each* defenceless head
 With the shadow of thy wing.

The italics will shew the alterations, which, in our judgement, while they destroy the spirit of the hymn as an expression of personal and appropriating faith in the Saviour, entirely fail to render it fit for public use. The exercises of private devotion and of social worship must of necessity be of a distinct character; and the greatest defect, perhaps, in this part of our public worship, as at present conducted, is, not that hymns are sung in which the singular is used by the congregation uniting in the same address, (to which we see no very strong objection,) but that hymns unfit for the use of any congregation, and such as Dr. Watts could not have designed for social worship, are chosen with little discrimination;—sometimes for no better reason than as having been adapted to a favourite tune; at other times, as bearing upon a particular subject or sentiment, without regard to its suitableness in other respects.

We could have wished that Dr. Urwick had named the popular hymn he refers to, which he found given with ten variations in the first verse. Is it possible that a hymn admitting of such variations, and so obviously requiring emendation, could ever have become ‘popular’, except through the prevalence of bad taste, since it is evident that it must be destitute of any poetic merit? If such a hymn is worth preserving in any shape, it must be owing to associations connected with it, from long usage, which would be violated and broken up by altering the phraseology; or else as embodying some Scriptural idea or happy thought, to which the writer was unable to give correct and musical expression, in which case it were better to recast the hymn altogether. An instance of this kind occurs to us in the favourite yet very indifferent hymn, beginning,

‘Guide me, O thou great Jehovah.’

In this hymn, the singular form is improper, not for the reason adduced by Dr. Urwick, but because the subject requires the plural. The beauty and propriety of the symbolical language are greatly diminished, when the miraculous history of ancient Israel is treated as allegorizing the life of the individual Christian, rather than the course of believers as a peculiar people,—the body and church of Christ. The Divine title, Jehovah, is that which belongs to the God of Israel more especially as He who “led his people as a flock by the hand of Moses and Aaron.” The hymn, in its original form, is faulty in other respects. The want of rhyme betrays the deficient skill of an unpractised writer; but still more the halting sense of the second stanza, and the tame and flat effect of the line which winds up the hymn. Dissatisfied with its sorry composition, yet anxious to retain it, various editors have tried their hands at alteration. In the

Durham Selection, (1823,) as in Dr. Urwick's, the plural form is substituted for the singular; and a fourth verse is interpolated, which is not in keeping with the rest*. In the St. John's Chapel Selection, the plural form is also adopted, together with some verbal alterations intended to mend the verse; but such rhymes as *flow* and *renew*, *subside* and *side*, are worse than none. The last verse is thus given:

‘ When we tread the verge of Jordan,
 Bid our anxious fears subside:
 Bear us thro’ death’s awful torrent,
 Land us safe on Canaan’s side:
 Where with Jesus
 We for ever shall abide.’

In the Sheffield Selection, (1819,) the hymn is given in the plural form, with slight variations; also in Bickersteth’s “Christian Psalmody”, and several others. In Montgomery’s “Christian Psalmist”, the hymn is altogether omitted, as if the Editor could not bring himself to give so miserable a specimen of versification as the original presents, and yet was afraid to touch it. Among the original hymns, however, there is one entitled ‘The Christian Israel’, in which the same allegory is very beautifully treated. Mr. Kelly has, among his “Hymns adapted for Social Worship”, one obviously in close imitation of the old one, beginning:—

‘ Saviour! through the desert lead us;
 Without thee we cannot go.
 Thou from cruel chains hast freed us;
 Thou hast laid the tyrant low.
 Let thy presence
 Cheer us all our journey through.’

The hymn is too long, and the allegory is pursued too much into detail, but it is otherwise an improvement upon the original. Still, the elder members of our congregations, accustomed to the sing-song cadence of the venerable ditty, and connecting every word with the favourite tune to which they have been wont to hear it sung, resent any alteration, preferring old doggrel to new poetry. It can therefore hardly be expected, that the following bold attempt to recast the hymn, with some attention to metrical correctness, will satisfy the ‘good old folk.’

‘ O Thou great Jehovah! lead us,
 Pilgrims through this barren land.

* In Toplady’s Collection, a fourth verse is tacked on, which is actually in a different metre!

Thou who hast from bondage freed us,
Guard us with Thy mighty hand.
Bread of heaven !
Nourished by Thy grace we stand.

‘ As Thou didst in wondrous manner
Guide Thy chosen flock aright,
Let Thy presence be our banner,
Cloud by day and fire by night.
Thy protection
Be our shield, Thy word our light.

‘ When we come to Jordan’s river,
Should we dread the swelling tide,
Death of death, life’s Source and Giver,
Bid the narrow stream divide.
Joyful praises
We will sing on Canaan’s side.’

Congregational Hymn Book.

Other favourite hymns might be instanced, which, like the quaint doings of Sternhold and Hopkins, and the still more miserable doggerel of the Scotch Version, seem indebted for their strong hold upon popular feeling to the mysterious sublimity which attaches to things indistinctly intelligible, indefinite, and shapeless, or imposingly ugly. The strongest feelings are generally wedded to bad taste. Beauty appeals to the senses, not to the imagination ; and that which charms the ear, stops there. But the rude or mis-shapen idol, the rustic rhyme, the old catch or ballad, and, in like manner, the worst specimens of sacred verse, are often found to excite and to fascinate the imagination much more strongly than the most finished productions of art. The late venerable Mr. Romaine is known to have greatly preferred the Old Version of the Psalms to what he styled the whims of Dr. Watts. The good man’s bigotry no doubt had some influence in perverting his taste ; but to this day, the Presbyterians of the Kirk retain their preference of compositions perfectly barbarous to English ears. Sheer nonsense of course must fail to gain hold of the mind ; but there is an approximation to nonsense, which is often more captivating to certain minds than pure and rigorous sense. This will account for the fondness discovered for some psalms and hymns of the very lowest order of merit, which we scarcely dare to particularize. In one very favourite hymn, occurs a passage as nearly approaching to nonsense as can well be conceived :

‘ Praise the Mount ; oh, fix me on it,
Mount of God’s unchanging love.’

In some Collections, an attempt has been made to mend this ;

but correction destroys the charm, which lies in the no-meaning itself. We will mention only another precious composition, of which this is the first verse :

‘ O’er the gloomy hills of darkness,
Look my soul, be still, and gaze ;
All the promises do travail
With a glorious day of grace ;
Blessed jubilee !
Let thy glorious morning dawn.’

If some profane wit had composed this in pure burlesque of our hymns, he could not have produced anything more exquisitely ridiculous. Here are six lines in the shape of verse, but between two only there is the semblance of rhyme, viz., gaze and grace, which do *not* rhyme. What is meant by ‘ hills of darkness’, it is not for us to explain. As to the idea of all the promises being in travail with a day of grace, we hardly know whether most to admire the correctness of the metaphor or the elegance of the expression. But criticism is set at defiance by the sublimity of this hymn. Mark the boldness of the apostrophe in another stanza :

‘ Fly abroad, thou mighty Gospel,
Win and conquer, never cease !
May thy lasting wide dominions
Multiply and still increase.’

Yet is this inane verbiage preferred by some worthy people to the noblest compositions of sanctified genius ; and to blot it out from our hymn-books would be deemed a species of sacrilege. In the “Christian Psalmist”, we find an attempt to substitute something like sense and metre for this hymn, by the Rev. Mr. Cotterill, beginning thus :

‘ O’er the realms of pagan darkness
Let the eye of pity gaze :
See the kindreds of the people
Lost in sin’s bewildering maze ;
Darkness brooding
On the face of all the earth.’

The absence of rhyme in the last line grievously disappoints the ear : otherwise the hymn is tolerable, though not above mediocrity. Mr. Kelly’s hymn,

‘ Yes, we trust the day is breaking,’—

though not an imitation of what is not worth imitating, is a still

better substitute for it, being in the same metre. He has also another in the same strain :

‘ Men of God ! go take your stations.’

But the idea of the hymn, so far as there is an idea in it, has been far more beautifully expanded by Mr. Montgomery, in one of the finest missionary hymns in the language, beginning,

“ Let there be light ! ” thus spake the Word.’

It will be some time, however, before the genius of Montgomery, and the happy talent of Kelly, will succeed in driving out of use the cherished nonsense which brings tears from aged and even reverend eyes.

To return to the subject of editorial alterations ;—as a general rule, it may be safely affirmed, that a hymn which requires to be materially altered, is not worth preserving : the only exceptions to the rule are such cases as require a compromise with the public, in favour of a few hymns that cannot well be spared, although of small intrinsic excellence. With regard to Watts himself, very few of his hymns that tempt alteration, or really require it, claim to be retained. Generally speaking, the best workmanship has been bestowed upon the best materials, and his faults are most prominent in the psalms that are the least adapted to edification. The fire of devotion and the flame of poetry rise and fall together. The want of rhyme is not only a fault in itself, but, as Mr. Montgomery has remarked, ‘ is the cause of half the faults ‘ that may be found in inferior compositions,—negligence, feebleness, and prosing.’ And this cause of negligence and feebleness has affected the compositions of Dr. Watts, though not to an equal extent with those of his imitators, by whom his defects have been ‘ faithfully adopted ’, while his merits are unapproachable by them. In a judicious revision of Watts, a very large proportion of his duplicate versions of the Psalms, and of the hymns in his first book, might be struck out without being missed ; and if a proper distinction were made between those of the remainder which are fit for congregational psalmody, and those which are adapted only for private use, few alterations would be necessary ; and none ought to be made, that would affect the genuineness of the composition.

Doddridge, as a hymn writer, stands upon a very different footing. He had neither an ear for versification, nor any other quality of the poet ; and little in his hymns is worth preserving, beyond the thought, generally so rudely and harshly expressed, and the fervent piety which they indicate. We do not recollect at this moment a single hymn of the 375, which is free from the marks of defective skill or carelessness in the versification, or of

false taste in the expression. Accordingly, no Editor thinks of using his hymns without curtailing or altering them. The most popular of all, perhaps, is the one beginning,

‘Lord of the Sabbath, hear our vows,’—

which has been transferred to most of our Collections, but with variations that it would be amusing to exhibit. In such a case, no scruple needs be felt in recasting the entire hymn, or in translating it, as it were, into correct phraseology. Doddridge can long retain his place among hymn-writers only upon this condition. His book, as a whole, is already laid aside; and it never was in extensive use, even as a supplement to Watts, for congregational worship. Its prevailing character, indeed, setting aside the deficiency of poetic merit, is too didactic, too *family-expository*. Yet, the name of Doddridge is justly dear, and one would wish to retain him as a contributor to our psalmody. Montgomery, who has done ample justice to the redeeming qualities of his hymns, has given twenty-one of them in his *Christian Psalmist*. Dr. H. F. Burder has selected thirty-seven. In the *Congregational Hymn-book*, the number taken from Doddridge is forty-eight; but several of them are materially altered, and are accordingly so distinguished. As a specimen, we will take a hymn which, as originally written, though deemed worthy of selection by Mr. Montgomery as one of the best, is singularly defective in rhyme, while the short metre particularly requires it.

‘How swift the torrent rolls,
That hastens to the sea!
How strong the tide that bears our souls
On—to eternity!

‘Our fathers, where are they?
With all they call’d their own;
Their joys and griefs, and hopes and cares,
And wealth and honour gone.

‘There, where the fathers lie,
Must all the children dwell;
Nor other heritage possess,
But such a narrow cell.

‘God of our fathers, hear,
Thou everlasting Friend!
While we, on life’s extremest verge,
Our souls to Thee commend.

‘Of all the pious dead
May we the footsteps trace,
Till with them in the land of light
We dwell before Thy face.’

Nothing can be more trite and common-place than the first verse, which seems scarcely to belong to the hymn. The real subject appears to have been taken from Zech. i. 5, "Your Fathers, where are they?" and in the following *new edition* of the hymn, the supernumerary verse is struck out.

' Our fathers, where are they,
With all they called their own?
Their joys and griefs have passed away,
Their wealth and honour gone.

' There, where the fathers sleep,
Must all their children dwell;
Nor other heritage can keep,
Than such a narrow cell.

' God of our fathers! be
Our everlasting Friend,
Lord of the dead and living! we
Our souls to Thee commend.

' Of all the pious dead,
May we the footsteps trace;
Till, gathered round our glorious Head,
We dwell before Thy face.'

Congregational Hymn Book.

Few hymns, however, that require such alteration, have substance enough to bear or to repay the working up of the rude outline into the shape and polish of poetry; and if the hymn be too familiarly known, it will not be safe to risk the attempt. In fact, the most complete success is *forgiven*, rather than admired; and for this reason in part, that the alteration seems to reflect upon the want of thought, or want of taste, betrayed by those who have been content with the composition as it stood. Upon all these accounts, the task of a reviser is an extremely delicate and thankless one; and, as has been already intimated, he must in many cases submit to a compromise with the public. After all, the best hymns admit of no improvement. We must not be misled by names. Cowper has written some very prosaic and indifferent hymns, not fit for public worship, and scarcely worth retaining, while his reverend and unpoetical co-adjutor in the Olney Hymns, occasionally rises into excellence. But, although the compositions of the best poets are not always the best hymns in point of composition, those which are the best in composition are generally found to be the best hymns in all respects.

We have before us another collection of Psalms and Hymns, including a selection from Dr. Watts, edited by the Rev. T. Willcocks, and printed at Devonport in 1824, which has the merit of a good arrangement, and is certainly copious enough, comprising 1131 hymns. Few alterations have been introduced

in the hymns selected, and no very fastidious taste has been displayed in the choice of hymns, which seems to have been governed by the subject, rather than by the merit of the composition. In this Collection, all the names of authors are given. Not so in the Selection attributed to the Rev. Josiah Pratt, entitled "Three Hundred and Fifty Portions of the Book of Psalms selected from various Versions, with a Collection of Six Hundred Hymns, adapted for Public Worship." In this volume, Dr. Watts is the more unfairly treated, because not only is his name suppressed, but there is something like an attempt to conceal the extent to which the Editor has made use of his Version. 'Other Denominations of Christians,' it is remarked in the Advertisement, 'had, in a great degree, long enjoyed, in Dr. Watts's Version, the true savour and spirit of the Psalter; which entirely pervade, with a much closer adherence to the Original, the recent Version of the Rev. William Goode: by the permission of the family of his deceased friend, the Editor has made ample use of the last mentioned Version.' This is an honourable testimony to the merit of Dr. Watts; and yet it seems to be intimated that it has been greatly surpassed, and almost superseded, by Mr. Goode's Version. No competent judge can admit this; and the ample use which it has been found necessary to make of Dr. Watts's Version, (nearly half the Psalms being his,) sufficiently attests its superior excellence. The poetical execution of Mr. Goode's Version never rises above mediocrity.

As we are upon the subject of Versions, this seems the proper place to notice the New Version of Mr. Farr, who asks in his Preface, 'Is it not to be lamented, that these compositions, (the Psalms,) so beautiful in themselves, should not have been rendered, by some happy genius, into approved verse? True,' he says, 'we have Watts, but Watts professes only to write in imitation; and we have the classical Merrick; but Merrick professes not to write for the purpose of Psalmody.' A very easy mode of disposing of Watts and Merrick, to make way for one's own Version; but Mr. Farr ought to have known that there were some other names to be disposed of. It is no recommendation of a Writer, that he either is, or affects to be, ignorant of the attempts of his predecessors. That the present Writer has essayed a task for which he is wholly disqualified, will be made plain to all our readers by a single specimen.

PSALM XXIII.

God the Shepherd of his People.

The Lord is my shepherd divine,
No want shall I e'er undergo;
Thro' him I in quiet recline,
Where pastures abundantly grow.

- ' By the borders of still flowing streams,
He leads ; and whenever I stray,
My soul for his namesake redeems ;
And guideth my feet in his way.
- ' Though I walk thro' Death's shadowy vale,
No evil or foe will I fear ;
Thy rod and thy staff shall prevail,
My defence and my comforter there.
- ' My table with plenty is spread,
In presence of foes that surround ;
With oil thou anointest my head,
My cup with thy mercy is crown'd.
- ' Oh, surely such goodness and love
Insure to me peace all my days ;
I shall dwell in his temple above,
There pay him my tribute of praise.'

In 1829 appeared a " New Metrical Version of the Psalms, adapted for Devotional Purposes, by W. Wrangham ; " which claims a passing notice, as being at least as successful as the Version of Mr. Farr. Both, however, have fallen into the absurd error of supposing, that nothing more is necessary to fit the entire book of Psalms for use in Christian worship, than to versify them as they stand, adhering to the literal sense. We cannot see why, taking such a view of them, they should be versified at all. The old method of chanting them as given in the Public Translation, we should much prefer to the congregational use of a metrical version, such as either old Sternhold's or Bishop Mant's*, Mr. Farr's or Mr. Wrangham's. The following is a very favourable specimen of the last mentioned.

' PSALM LI.

' 1.

- ' According to thy word,
Let me thy mercy prove ;
Blot out my past transgressions, LORD,
And save me by Thy love.

' 2.

- ' Wash me from ev'ry stain
Which vice and guilt impart ;
Let me, O LORD, Thy love regain,
And cleanse my sinful heart.

* For a review of Bp. Mant's Version, see *Eclect. Rev.*, 2d Series, Vol. XXIII., p. 1. For a notice of E. G. Marsh's Metrical Translation of the Psalms, see *Ib.* 3d Series, Vol. VIII., p. 405. For a notice of Lyte's Spirit of the Psalms, and Judkins's Church Psalmody, *Ib.* Vol. XII., pp. 316, and 540.

‘ 3.

‘ To Thee my faults I own,
 My inward sins confess ;
 To Thee my great offence is known ;
 Thou know’st my sinfulness.

‘ 4.

‘ Should’st Thou withhold Thy grace,
 I dare not, LORD, complain ;
 For I appear before Thy face
 Unholy and profane.

‘ 5.

‘ Partaker of the sin
 Entail’d on Adam’s race ;
 My thoughts and words are all unclean,
 Till purified by grace.

‘ 6.

‘ Behold thou dost require,
 A just and perfect heart ;
 Thou shalt my soul with truth inspire,
 And wisdom’s aid impart.

‘ 7.

‘ With hyssop sprinkled o’er,
 My heart Thy love shall know,
 And, freed from sin’s vindictive pow’r,
 Be white as spotless snow.

‘ 8.

‘ Make me with joy to hear,
 O LORD, Thy pard’ning voice ;
 Assuage my pain, my spirit cheer,
 And bid my bones rejoice.

‘ 9, 10, 11.

‘ All my transgressions heal,
 Thy cleansing grace impart ;
 Let me Thy Holy Spirit feel,
 To purify my heart.

‘ 12, 13.

‘ To me Thy love restore,
 From trouble set me free ;
 That sinners may Thine aid implore,
 And turn in faith to Thee.

‘ 14.

‘ Though blood my conscience stain,
 To me salvation bring ;
 Let me Thy pard’ning grace obtain,
 And of thy goodness sing.

‘ 15.

‘ O God, my lips uncloset,
That I my voice may raise;
Then whilst my heart observes Thy laws,
My mouth shall speak Thy praise.

‘ 16, 17.

‘ Could flocks and herds atone,
I would an off’ring make;
But Thou a contrite heart alone
As sacrifice wilt take.

‘ 18.

‘ O let Thy peace and love
O’er Zion’s city spread;
Build up her walls, her works approve,
And blessings round her shed.

‘ 19.

‘ Then shall their off’rings rise
In truth and righteousness;
Thou shalt receive their sacrifice,
And all Thy people bless.’

These various misjudged and abortive attempts—and to enumerate all would form a long catalogue—serve but to illustrate still more strikingly by contrast the extraordinary merit and general felicity of Dr. Watts, who not only led the way in shewing the true use to be made of the Psalms, but, in his happier imitations, has never been surpassed. We have no fear, therefore, that his compositions will ever come to be disused, although his book may be superseded; but we are anxious that neither the name of their Author should be unrighteously suppressed, nor their genuineness be destroyed by injudicious *improvements*.

A revised edition of Watts is a *desideratum*, in which the psalms and hymns never used, and ineligible, might be omitted, and some retrenchments be made in the remainder; but the most embarrassing question would respect the arrangement. The division into four books, each having its separate numeration, is confessedly inconvenient. Yet, if any other distribution be adopted, (as in Rippon’s Arrangement,) the genuineness of the *book* seems destroyed, though not of its contents. We do not know that this objection ought to have much weight, but we could not but advert to it. A more serious objection to disturbing the arrangement, so far as regards the Psalms, is the one stated by Dr. Allen: ‘that the Psalms are too interesting and important, and too familiar to the reader, to allow their order to be broken up and destroyed.’ We lay no stress upon giving the Psalms in their order of succession in the Bible; but we are unwilling that they

should be merged, as it were, in the general name of Hymns, instead of forming a distinct feature of our Psalmody. We took occasion to intimate in a former article *, our conviction that even the superstitious reverence for the letter of the Psalter has had a beneficial effect, in preventing a wider departure from the true spirit of worship in this part of the public service. The use of the Psalms has placed and kept before us a fixed standard of devotional taste, a pattern and model of that eucharistic worship which ought to be a very chief part of the service of the Christian sanctuary. Yet, so little have the Psalms been regarded as a model by modern hymn-writers, that, take away those which are simple versions, or imitations, or paraphrases of particular Psalms, and we shall find few compositions that breathe the genuine spirit of Psalmody. The voice of thanksgiving is rarely heard in our churches or our tabernacles, except in the strains of Watts.

On this account, then, we feel some reluctance to give up the old division into Psalms and Hymns. Yet, as the Psalms are not altogether of a eucharistic or devotional nature, many being historical, prophetic, didactic, or a elegiac, much is to be said in favour of a classification founded upon their specific character; and in that case, the hymns of similar complexion might be properly classed with them. Thus we should not have to turn to different books for Psalm viii., so admirably rendered in Dr. Watts's Common Metre Version, and Hymn 62 of Book I., which would have been sufficient to immortalize the name of the Writer, had he written no other. Both are hymns of praise to the Redeemer. So Hymn lxxix., B. I., is in fact an imitation of the sixth Psalm. It is unnecessary to multiply references, to shew that Dr. Watts has adopted a plan of arrangement, suited, indeed, to meet the prejudices of his day in favour of a servile and almost exclusive use of the Psalter, but not recommended by permanent utility or propriety. If such an edition of Watts, revised, abridged, and arranged as we propose, were executed so as to give general satisfaction, (a thing only not impossible,) it might after a while be safely incorporated with our supplemental hymnology;—but not before.

A word or two respecting the various Collections intended to be supplemental to Watts. Of these, so far as our information serves us, four only have gained an extensive circulation; namely, Dr. Rippon's Selection, which for many years enjoyed a sort of monopoly; the Rev. George Burder's Supplement, which has run through between twenty and thirty editions; the Rev. T.

* Eclect. Rev., 3d Series, Vol. XIII., (May, 1835,) Article, *Psalmody and Hymnology*.

Russell's, which is certainly superior to either; and the New Baptist Selection, which, though not so good as it ought to have been, is superseding Dr. Rippon's to a great extent among the congregations of that denomination. Dr. Collyer's Collection (1812) was in all respects a failure. Of the 979 hymns, not half are adapted for public worship; and the arrangement, under the names of the authors, is the worst possible for a hymn-book. The bulk and price of the volume also precluded its being extensively adopted. The Leeds Supplement (1822) exhibits the marks of great care and pains; but the 'Scriptural arrangement' which has been adopted, has led the Editors to choose hymns less with reference to their intrinsic merit, than as bearing upon particular passages of Scripture. The connexion between the hymn and the motto is often extremely slight and equivocal, and many are confessedly of a very prosaic character. To these objections we must add, the alterations introduced, which are not always judicious, and the suppression of the authors' names. The Durham "Selection" (1823) is also anonymous, as regards both the authorship and the editorship. No alterations appear to have been introduced; and the collection has the merit of being well arranged, copious, and cheap. But we cannot say much in favour of the taste shewn in the compilation.

We believe that we have enumerated all the principal Selections supplemental to Watts now in circulation, except the one just published under the auspices of the Congregational Union, of which we shall here say nothing, as it will more properly come under distinct notice. That there was room for such a publication, and an urgent demand for it, is sufficiently obvious; and if the denomination for whose use it has been compiled should not prove more difficult to be pleased than the Baptist denomination, this hymn-book, though it cannot be expected to give universal satisfaction, stands a fair chance of becoming an outward and visible sign of unity, as well as a bond of union, among the Churches of the Independent order.

Such was formerly Dr. Watts's Psalms and Hymns, long used to the exclusion of all others, and by common consent, without any act of uniformity to compel its adoption. And never, we trust, will the volume be laid aside, which has so long been the evangelical standard of our public worship, till the broad seal of common consent shall have been conspicuously affixed to whatever revised edition of Dr. Watts's productions and supplemental hymn-book shall be deemed worthy of superseding it in general use, as a devotional standard and metrical ritual.

This article has extended much beyond our original intention, or we should be tempted to add a few words upon what is, after all, as much more important than the beauties of composition, as the end is more excellent than the means; namely, the true design and use of

Psalmody. In our last Number, we noticed an admirable work on the "Manner of Prayer": a work on the Manner of Psalmody is not less needed. In no part of our public service is an entire reform more imperatively demanded. Till our ministers can be induced to take the entire direction of this essential part of congregational worship into their own hands, and sedulously to qualify themselves for the competent discharge of this part of their duty, at whatever cost or sacrifice it may involve,—the preparation of the best hymn-books will be of small avail. A bad reader, a self-conceited and intractable clerk, or a noisy, ill-trained choir, if suffered to usurp the management, will, in spite of all that poets, and editors, and musical composers can do to raise the character of our psalmody, mar the effect, and frustrate the very purpose of the service. But the solemn and decent performance of the best chosen hymns to the best adapted harmonies, delightful as it would render our congregational singing, which is too often a disgusting annoyance, hostile to devotional feeling,—even this is but a means to an end. Those feelings require to be cultivated, which sacred harmony was intended to express; the eucharistic spirit of psalmody requires to be awakened and brought into play; our singing must again become what it was in the early days of Protestantism,—an exercise of the heart, an 'ingredient in 'the happiness of social life,' a solace in affliction, a holy mirth in seasons of cheerfulness, the voice of thanksgiving, the perpetual confession of faith in the language of hope and love, the best exciter of the social affections, the very tuning of the mind for the other exercises of piety and for the active service of God.

Art. II. *The History of Protestant Nonconformity in England, from the Reformation under Henry VIII.* By Thomas Price. In two Volumes. Vol. I. 8vo. London, 1836.

EVERY traveller in search of the picturesque, is aware that it is not on the high road his taste is most likely to be gratified. We may pass through the counties of Devon and Cornwall, from Axminster to the Land's End, and know little after all of the beauties of the country. But, in many a private and almost unfrequented path, following the course of the valley and the stream, the adventurer will be rewarded for his wandering, by frequent bursts of the most lovely and magnificent scenery. So it is in history. It is not always on the beaten road, that we find its most beautiful and interesting scenes. Historians, like the rest of mankind, are attracted by the grand and more prominent events of nations, which stand out from the rest like the hills and mountains of the natural landscape; while they often, from ignorance or prejudice, pass those events unnoticed, which would be most

important and interesting to the reader. Wars and parliamentary proceedings occupy the principal place in history; but a very slight degree of attention is bestowed upon the influences of Christianity on national happiness. Such changes, indeed, as the Reformation, both in Germany and in England, are too vast, and involve consequences too momentous, to be passed over in silence. But the strife of opinions, in our own country, between the hierarchy and its opponents, has, in many cases, met with inadequate notice. Hume takes but a brief and cursory view of the Puritans; and though even his reluctant praise is sometimes extorted, it is easily seen that he regards them with a contempt which he scarcely takes any pains to conceal. Yet it is amongst the early Puritans, that we meet with most touching instances of piety patient in suffering, and heroic in action. Even on Hume's own confession, it is to the Puritans we owe all the freedom of the British constitution.

It is both interesting and useful, to trace the successive struggles of infant liberty. The opposers of that despotism in church and state, which was so prominent a feature in the reigns of the Tudors and Stuarts, were branded, indeed, with the most opprobrious names; and, like the early Christians, were accused of sedition and treason; but their principles eventually prevailed, beyond their expectations; and the progress of free inquiry has led, in the present age, to a general justification of their conduct, and to the adoption of those opinions for which they were imprisoned and died.

Our later historians have made a great approach towards rendering justice to these injured and neglected men; but, though such writers as Hallam and Mackintosh have done much to rescue their memory from undeserved obloquy, a history of Nonconformity, is, as it ever has been, a desideratum in our literature. Neal's History, though, in its way, invaluable, is far from being attractive to general readers. It is too bulky, and is occupied too much with dry and lengthy documents. The History of Dissent by Bogue and Bennett, relates chiefly to the later times of Nonconformity. No subject contains materials more precious, or more capable of being moulded into a work of intense interest. It has within itself, all the fearful elements of tragedy: the struggle of deadly passions; the force of stern and lofty principle; great designs, and noble sacrifices. There are also characters in high stations, kings and the rulers of the hierarchy; great minds, endowed with all the learning of their age; there is successful malice, and suffering virtue. And the shifting scenes present to our view, the secret midnight meeting for prayer, the capture, the prison, the stake. Such are the fearful incidents of the Puritanic history. It only needs an adequate pen, to make such a work one of absorbing interest to the whole community.

It is to be lamented also, that we have no biography of our nonconformist ancestors, composed especially for the young. Our children ought to be early informed of the principles and the heroic deaths of their forefathers. A book of this kind is wanted, not exceeding in size the Abridgement of Goldsmith's History of England, for the use of Dissenting schools and families. Such a work, containing the most striking incidents in the nonconformist history, composed by a man of genius and piety, and adorned with the graces of elegant literature, would be invaluable to the present and to future generations.

The social importance of English Dissenters is beginning to be felt and acknowledged by all classes. The vastness and perpetual increase of their numbers, their intelligence, and their influence in the political world, combine to make it impossible that they should be held in contempt, as in former times; while, if the ruling powers were inclined to persecute them, it would be a most dangerous experiment. It is amusing in the present day, to read the lamentation of Sandys, a bishop of London in Elizabeth's reign: 'There is a conventicle, or rather a conspiracy, breeding in London If these seditious and tumultuous beginnings be not met withal in time, they will in short space grow to great inconvenience.' What would be his Lordship's astonishment, could he rise from his grave, and see the number of conventicles now, not only in London, but in every town and village in the kingdom? How would he burst with rage and spite, at finding the nonconformist spirit so utterly beyond his control?

The identity of the cause of modern Dissenters with that of the Lollards and the Puritans, is, to us, a matter of high satisfaction; and we rejoice to belong to the religious communion which is one with them. Far be it, very far, from us to deny the existence of piety within the Establishment in the worst times; yet we feel that we are not wrong in regarding the history of nonconformity in this country, as the history of its religion. The ecclesiastical annals of our land shew that the struggle of the hierarchy has been, not with sectarianism, but with piety itself. For, though some of the subjects of controversy, in the early period of the Reformation, seem to us puerile, they were yet important, as they involved the rights of conscience. The great error of the national Church, from the beginning, has been, that she has cast out from her bosom, those who were men of conscience, the most holy and noble within her pale; while the unprincipled, who would conform to any thing, were retained as a useless burden and a curse. In the hands of the persecuting party, the Church became the filter of the nation, purifying that which passed through it, while it retained the corruption and dregs.

Of some periods in our history, an incorrect estimate has long prevailed. In certain cases, this is easily accounted for. The accession of Elizabeth, immediately after her cruel sister, caused her to be welcomed with the most joyful acclamations. This was natural, for almost any monarch would have appeared to advantage, after such a monster as Mary. Yet, on a calm and impartial review of her government, how little claim has she to be called 'the good queen Bess'! Her reign is, in many respects, the disgrace of the British annals. The hardships which the lady Elizabeth had herself undergone, produced no good effect on her character, and led to no sympathy with the persecuted. Intolerance, and the most revolting despotism, marked the whole course of her life. She certainly displayed no ordinary wisdom in the choice of her ministers, of whom Burleigh, Leicester, and some others, exhibited a leaning towards liberal measures, not always agreeable to their mistress. The bishops, with some noble exceptions, were ready tools in the execution of her intolerant purposes. With the exception of Grindal, who was deposed for his liberality, those who filled the office of primate were as fierce and unrelenting as the despot herself could desire. The names of Parker and Whitgift, together with Bancroft and Laud in subsequent reigns, are pre-eminent in the annals of Protestant persecutions.

But, as usually happens, the severity of the Church only increased the numbers of the disaffected; and it was with mortification and rage the Queen and her bishops saw the rapid growth of puritanism. Fuller, in his quaint style, says: 'Now nonconformity in the daies of King Edward was conceived, which afterward in the reign of Queen Mary (but beyond the sea at Frankfort) was born; which in the reign of Queen Elizabeth was nursed and weaned; which under King James grew up a young youth, or tall stripling; but towards the end of Charles his reign, shot up into the full strength and stature of a man, able, not only to cope with, but to conquer, the hierarchie, its adversary.'

Elizabeth has been usually lauded as the restorer of the Reformation; but it admits of question, whether she was not rather a grievous impediment to the progress of religious truth. At the beginning of her reign, the public mind was certainly in favour of an extensive reform in the Church.

'The Puritan party at this period,' says Mr. Price, 'was far more numerous than is generally supposed. It has been customary with a certain class of writers, to represent them as few in number, mean in rank, morose in temper, and contracted in their views. But the very reverse of this was the case. We have already seen that Elizabeth's first bishops approved of the Puritan objections, though they did not feel justified in exposing the nation to the return of Popery, by refusing,

on this account, to conform to the prescribed ceremonies. A very large proportion of the clergy was shewn, by the division in the convocation, to entertain the same views. They prevailed throughout the kingdom, especially amongst the most zealous and devout both of the clergy and of the laity. Many members of Cambridge University were deeply imbued with Puritanism, and the Parliament was no less affected with it. Even the Queen's council contained persons whose learning was decisively in this direction, so that nothing but Elizabeth's inflexible purpose, based on her half-popish creed, prevented its becoming the religion of the land. "I conceive," says one of the most accurate and impartial of historians, "the Church of England party, that is, the party adverse to any species of ecclesiastical change, to have been the least numerous of the three (Catholic, Church of England, Puritan) during this reign; still excepting, as I have said, the neutrals, who commonly make a numerical majority, and are counted along with the dominant religion. The Puritans, or at least those who rather favoured them, had a majority among the Protestant gentry in the Queen's days. It is agreed on all hands, and is quite manifest, that they predominated in the House of Commons. But that house was composed, as it has ever been, of the principal landed proprietors, and as much represented the general wish of the community when it demanded a further reform in religious matters, as on any other subjects. One would imagine, by the manner in which some express themselves, that the discontented were a small faction, who by some unaccountable means, in despite of the government and the nation, formed a majority of all Parliaments under Elizabeth and her two successors." (Hallam, *Const. Hist.* i. 257.) pp. 162, 3.

The ruling spirit of the storm, during the latter period of this reign, was Whitgift, who was a renegade from puritanism. His dark soul delighted in cruelty; and his conduct towards Cartwright, his former opponent in theological controversy, seems to partake, in no slight measure, of spite and revenge. That his severities were disapproved of by some belonging to the court, appears from a letter written to him by Lord Treasurer Burleigh.

"But now, my good lord," he says, "by chance I am come to the sight of an instrument of twenty-four articles of great length and curiosity, found in a Romish style, to examine all manner of ministers in this time, without distinction of persons. Which articles are entitled, *Apud Lambeth, May, 1584, to be executed, ex officio mero, &c.*, . . . which I have read, and find so curiously penned, so full of branches and circumstances, as I think the inquisitors of Spain use not so many questions to comprehend and trap their preys.

"I know your canonists can defend these with all their particles; but surely, under your grace's correction, this judicial and canonical sifting of poor ministers is not to edify or reform. And in charity, I think, they ought not to answer to all these nice points, except they were very notorious offenders in papistry or heresy. Now, my good lord, bear with my scribbling. I write with a testimony of a good con-

science. I desire the peace of the church. I desire concord and unity in the exercise of our religion. I favour no sensual and wilful recusants. But I conclude, that, according to my simple judgement, this kind of proceeding is too much favouring of the Romish inquisition, and is rather a device to seek for offenders, than to reform any. This is not the charitable instruction that I thought was intended. If these poor ministers should, in some few points, have any scrupulous conceptions fit to be removed, this is not a charitable way, to send them to answer to your common registrar, upon so many articles at one instant, without any commodity of instruction by your registrar, whose office is only to receive their answers. By which the parties are first subject to condemnation, before they be taught their error."—(*Strype's Whitgift*, i. 310, App. ix. p. 104.)' pp. 339, 40.

The character of the masculine Queen and swearing Head of the Church, is thus impartially and admirably given by Mr. Price.

‘ Her personal character has been variously drawn. By the writers of one party, she has been represented as eminently devout, imbued with the spirit, and influenced both in her private and public conduct by the principles of religion; while their opponents have described her as a compound of dissimulation, cruelty, and lust. A medium course between these conflicting representations will be found most accordant with the facts of her history, and the known temper of her mind. No doubt can be entertained of her distinguished talents. They were of a masculine order, and even better fitted to inspire awe, and to secure obedience, than to command regard. They were more suited to the sovereign than the female, and were shown in the skilful selection of her counsellors, and in her steady adherence to that line of policy which her own judgement and their suggestions alike approved. She knew what was due to the dignity of her crown, as well as any sovereign in Europe; and could, for the most part, command even her weakness and attachments when this was concerned. Her religion was, like that of most princes, a thing of policy and form. Protestant in name, but papist in spirit, she attended to the ceremonial parts of worship, but was utterly destitute of that reverence for the Deity, without which external services cannot be pleasing in his sight. The part which Elizabeth acted in restoring the Protestant Church of England, has caused her to be ranked as a religious woman. Her virtues have been exaggerated, and her defects cautiously concealed, by the advocates of that Church, so that her religious character has been totally misapprehended. She has received credit for principles of which she was totally destitute; and has been exhibited as a pattern of virtues, no one of which appeared in her deportment. She was strongly attached to some of the most obnoxious dogmas and rites of the Romish church, and on more than one occasion threatened her bishops with a re-instatement of the ancient faith. Warmly opposed to an increase of preaching ministers, she contended, with singular inconsistency, that it was good for the church to have but few, and that three or four were enough for a country. Her own attendance on their sermons was infrequent, being chiefly, if not entirely,

confined to the season of Lent. She was frequently in the use of profane oaths, and sometimes treated her bishops with an insulting asperity. The bishop of London, having on one occasion, when preaching before her, reflected on the vanity displayed by many persons in their apparel, she told her attendants, that if he 'held more discourses on such matters, she would fit him for heaven, but he should walk thither without a staff, and leave his mantle behind him'*. Such was the personal character of the queen, of whom the Church of England boasts as her restorer and ornament.

'The ecclesiastical government of Elizabeth grew naturally out of her temper and principles. Her arbitrary disposition led her to suspect and strongly to oppose the bold spirit of inquiry on which puritanism was engrafted, while her hatred of spiritual religion prompted her to discountenance and punish its most zealous advocates. The vital form which piety assumed in the ministrations of the puritans, could not fail to be offensive to a sovereign so ignorant of its nature. The ecclesiastical administration was based on an unchristian and mischievous principle. It employed force instead of persuasion, and substituted temporal rewards for the blessings of the gospel dispensation. The supremacy over the church was an assumption which no laws can justify, and which brought with it a thousand elements of secularity and corruption. It regarded religion as a matter of state policy, and the church as a creature of parliamentary statutes. The diffusion of the one, and the stability of the other, were sought to be advanced by the same agency as was employed in mere political affairs. Wealth and rank were conferred on the ministers of a favoured sect, who repaid the patronage which they received, by vesting their appointments in the crown. The splendour of the hierarchy was thus heightened, but its piety was enfeebled. What it gained in temporal dignity, it lost in moral strength. The tide of corruption set in strongly; and, though its course was for a season arrested, it ultimately carried away every obstruction, and forced its noxious waters through a thousand channels.

'The treatment which the puritans received from the government of Elizabeth, was progressively severe. In the early part of her reign, many of the bishops were friendly to their cause, but their views were modified by the collisions which ensued.

* * * * *

'The sufferings of the puritans during the primacy of Whitgift are not to be paralleled in the history of protestant intolerance; unless, perhaps, an exception may be made of the times of the second Charles.

* 'Cox, Bishop of Ely, having refused to alienate some of the possessions of his see, for the benefit of the Lord Keeper, Hatton, Elizabeth wrote to him the following laconic epistle:

"Proud prelate,

"You know what you were before I made you what you are; if you do not immediately comply with my request, by G— I will unfrock you. ELIZABETH."

The number of deprivations and imprisonments which took place, must have involved a mass of misery at which humanity may well weep, and the infliction of which it becomes the virtuous of every party to reprobate. That the puritans were immaculate, it would be folly to pretend. Their faults were numerous, and some of them glaring. But they were loyal subjects of the queen, and, as such, were entitled to the equal protection of her laws. The most envenomed hostility could not fasten upon them the charge of disaffection to her civil government; yet they were given over to the tender mercies of intolerant priests, who have ever been foremost in the career of persecution, and in the shedding of human blood. The capital error of the puritans was their imperfect acquaintance with the nature of religious liberty. Indistinct approaches to the truth are discoverable in some of their writings; but it is too evident to admit of doubt, that they were wholly unprepared to grant to others the freedom which they asked for themselves. This gave an inconsistency to their proceedings, and involved their successors in coercive measures which cannot be too severely condemned.' pp. 440—444.

On the accession of James, the puritan party 'was more numerous, more decided in hostility to the church, and more confident of ultimate success,' than at any former period, and excited greater fears in the mind of Whitgift, especially as he was uncertain what part the new king would take. The Nonconformists were elated with hope; for James, when in Scotland, had encouraged the Reformation. In a general assembly of the church, he had said, 'he praised God that he was born in the time of the 'light of the gospel, to such a place, as to be king of such a 'kirk, the sincerest kirk in the world. The kirks of Geneva,' he continued, 'keep Pasche and Yule, (Easter and Christmas,) 'what have they for them? They have no institution. As for 'our neighbour kirk of England, their service is an evil-said 'mass in English; they want nothing of the mass but the lift- 'ings. I charge you, my good people, ministers, doctors, elders, 'noblemen, gentlemen, and barons, to stand to your purity, and 'to exhort your people to do the same; and I, forsooth, so long 'as I brook my life and crown, I shall maintain the same.' But the Royal hypocrite soon threw off his mask, when he came to the land of prelacy. The result of the Hampton Court conference is well known. So unfair were the proceedings, that while, on the high church side, there were present the archbishop, eight bishops, seven deans, two doctors of divinity, and an archdeacon, there were only four ministers of the puritan party. Not only were the puritans refused all redress of their grievances, but the King treated their representations with rudeness and insult. It was on the request of Dr. Reynolds, that the prophesyings might be revived, and that certain cases of ecclesiastical discipline might be ultimately referred to the bishop and his presbytery, that the British Solomon, thinking a Scotch presbytery was meant, ut-

tered the following kingly speech. After declaring that a Scotch presbytery agreed with monarchy no better than God with the devil, he added: 'Then Jack, and Tom, and Will, and Dick, shall meet, and, at their pleasures, censure me and my council, and all our proceedings. Then Will shall stand up and say, it must be thus. Then Dick shall reply, and say, nay, marry, but we will have it thus. And therefore, here I must once re-iterate my former speech, *Le Roy s'avisera*. Stay, I pray you, for one seven years before you demand that of me; and if then you find me pursy and fat, and my wind-pipe stuffed, I will perhaps hearken to you.'

Who can read an account of these proceedings without indignation, especially when he finds Whitgift declaring, on one occasion during this conference, 'that undoubtedly His Majesty spake by the special assistance of God's Spirit'; and Bancroft, on his knee, acknowledging 'unto Almighty God the singular mercy we have received at his hands, in giving us such a king, as since Christ's time, he thought, had not been?' It is likely that our readers will be of the same opinion, whatever may be their thoughts as to the especial thankfulness which such a gift was calculated to inspire.

But, though the Puritans continued to be treated with scorn, the principles of liberty, both civil and religious, were striking their roots deep into the soil. This was apparent in the growing uncontrollableness of the nonconformist party. The sagacious observer might perceive the gathering of the clouds which portended the fearful storm that, in the course of one generation, was destined to convulse the nation, and overthrow the throne, and eventually to expel the race of Stuart from their dominions. Notwithstanding the atrocities of Bancroft, who succeeded Whitgift in the see of Canterbury, Nonconformity made rapid progress; and in his reign arose the sect of Independents, now so considerable in our country. Perhaps we have no more striking instance of the adulation which is paid to kings, even when dead, than in the ludicrous panegyric pronounced on James, by Bishop Williams, who at great length draws a parallel between the Royal Pedant and king Solomon.

' " I dare presume to say, you never read in your lives of two kings more fully paralleled amongst themselves, and better distinguished from all other kings besides themselves. King Solomon is said to be *unigenitus coram matre sua*, the only son of his mother; so was King James. Solomon was of a complexion white and ruddy; so was King James. Solomon was an infant king, *puer parvulus*, a little child; so was King James a king at the age of thirteen months. Solomon began his reign in the life of his predecessor; so, by the force and compulsion of that State, did our late Sovereign King James. Solomon was twice crowned and anointed a king; so was King James. So-

lomon's minority was rough, through the quarrels of the former Sovereign ; so was that of King James. Solomon was learned above all the princes of the East ; so was King James above all the princes in the universal world. Solomon was a writer in prose and verse ; so, in a very pure and exquisite manner, was our sweet Sovereign King James. Solomon was the greatest patron we ever read of to church and churchmen ; and yet no greater (let the house of Aaron now confess) than King James. Solomon was honoured with ambassadors from all the kings of the earth ; and so, you know, was King James. Solomon was a main improver of his home commodities, as you may see in his trading with Hiram ; and, God knows, it was the daily study of King James. Solomon was the great maintainer of shipping and navigation ; a most proper attribute to King James. Solomon beautified very much his capital city with buildings and water-works ; so did King James. Every man lived in peace under his vine and fig-tree, in the days of Solomon ; and so they did in the blessed days of King James. And yet, towards his end, King Solomon had secret enemies, Razan, Hadad, and Jeroboam, and prepared for a war upon his going to the grave ; so had, and so did King James. Lastly, before any hostile act we read of in the history, King Solomon died in peace, when he had lived about sixty years ; and so, you know, did King James." p. 544, note.

It is most clear that the good bishop was no Solomon ; but when we read this unique eulogy, we cannot help entertaining the vain wish that it had been possible for King James to hear his own funeral sermon. It would have delighted him even to ecstasy.

Of Mr. Price's work, only the first volume is yet published. This carries on the history no further than the death of James I. ; and we are at a loss to conjecture how he can, with justice to his subject, compress the remainder into the compass of a single volume. The reign of Charles I., the Commonwealth, the Restoration, with all the tragical events which took place in the Second Charles's reign, will demand at least another volume, if any thing like proportion be preserved in the several parts of the work.

The part which is published is, in a high degree, creditable to its Author. Candour and impartiality are maintained throughout. Mr. Price has not concealed the faults of the Puritans ; nor has he exaggerated the vices, or denied the virtues, of their adversaries ; but has awarded an equitable judgement to men of all parties. There is no attempt to conceal his own opinions ; but those opinions are never expressed with violence, nor in language in the least unbecoming the calm dignity of the historian. Our admiration has, indeed, been frequently excited, in going through his volume, at the command under which he has kept his mind, even when an honest burst of indignation might well have been excused.

The style in which the work is written is decidedly good, as will be seen in the extracts we have given, but with a singular destitution of ornament. To the graces of literary composition, and the sparkles of a lively fancy, Mr. Price makes no pretensions: and this we are tempted to regret. For, although the likeness is preserved in his portraits, we could have wished there had been more life and spirit infused into them. A more skilful distribution of light and shadow, and more brilliant colouring, while they would not have diminished the faithfulness of the picture, would have added to it an attraction and a charm which no mere faithfulness can give.

But the work has solid and substantial excellences, which will recommend it to the judicious reader. The selection of facts is interesting; the references are satisfactory; the solution of controverted points in the history, sometimes critically nice, displaying careful research and a skilful balancing of evidence and authorities. To this we may add, that, in the qualities of paper and type, the book is attractive to the eye. We heartily recommend it to the attention of our readers.

Art. III. *Collekten-reise nach Holland und England, nebst einer ausführlichen Darstellung des Kirchen—Schul—Armen—und Gefängnisswesens beider Länder mit vergleichender Hinweisung auf Deutschland, vorzüglich Preussen*, von Theodor Fliedner evang. Pfarrer in Kaiserwerth bei Düsseldorf. 2 Bde. pp. xxviii. 986. Essen-bei Bädker, 1831.

[Collecting-Tour to Holland and England, with a circumstantial Description of the Church Constitution, Establishments for Education, and Systems of Pauper and Prison Discipline in both Countries; and a Comparison of them with those of Germany, and particularly of Prussia: by Theodore Fliedner, Minister at Kaiserwerth, near Dusseldorf. 2 vols. 1831.]

[Continued from page 189.]

HOLLAND is not undistinguished in the ecclesiastical history of Europe. Our readers can hardly be ignorant, how large a share is to be ascribed to the spirit of Protestantism, in the long continued struggle maintained in the Low Countries against the oppressive tyranny of Philip the Second of Spain; nor of the ascendancy of the principles of the reformed Church, after the acknowledgment of the United Provinces by his successor in the treaty of 1609. Years before this time, however, important differences had begun to manifest themselves among the Protestant clergy; and Leyden itself, the principal seat of reformed theology in the provinces, had, on the appointment of the celebrated Arminius to a professor's chair, become the arena of theological dispute, through the opposition which he raised to the system of his

senior, Gomarus. Into the history of this protracted contest, it is neither necessary nor desirable that we should enter, further than by remarking, that, as will always be the case where the church is the creature of the State, and subsists upon state patronage, it was at last decided on political, rather than religious grounds. Gomarus, the inflexible representative and advocate of Calvinism in its most rigid form, and a very able and distinguished man, was avowedly hostile to the toleration of even the smallest departure from his favourite standard of orthodoxy; and although the eloquent and engaging Arminius, to do him justice, manifested, in the commencement of the struggle, a milder disposition, and an inclination to entrust his cause to reason and to scripture, we must not imagine his sagacity so much in fault as to have been insensible to the necessity of moderation while opposed to an overwhelming majority, or overlook the fact that this moderation was by no means imitated by those who succeeded him. Each party, in fact, fell back on one of the two great factions which were then contending for political sway; the Arminians (called also Remonstrants, from the defensive papers published by them in 1610) adhering to the republican or popular, the Gomarists, to the Orange faction, for support. Thus, through the success of the latter faction some years after, the Gomarists were enabled, in 1618, to convoke a national synod, before which the Remonstrants were summoned to appear, in answer to certain charges which were then preferred against them, as corrupters of the Christian doctrine. Their condemnation on this imputed ground in the following year, served, however, not only the sectarian objects of their theological adversaries, but, as was throughout intended, those also of the political enemies of the party with which they had coalesced, since, whatever motives we may admit to have prevailed in the ejection and forced exile of the Remonstrant clergy, there is no question, either that political, rather than religious reasons were mainly influential in procuring the execution of Barneveldt and the imprisonment of Grotius; or, that state policy rendered subservient to its own purposes, the theological odium which itself had fanned against them. Thus, through the intermingling of political interests, and the abuse of political power, enormities of persecution were perpetrated most revolting to the spirit of the gospel, and a mournful division was perpetuated in the church, to which, but for this, the healing influence of time, the subsidence of excitement, and the returning exercise of wise reflection and of christian love, would hardly have failed to administer a remedy.

The whole history presents a painful, though not uncommon scene. On the one hand, men of unquestionable piety and learning, contending, as we cannot permit ourselves to doubt, for what both parties respectively considered the interests of Christian

truth, did not shudder to call in the aid of the mighty but rude hand of secular force, to suppress in their opponents the dearest, most inward, and most inalienable of all privileges and all duties, the exercise of conscience. On the other hand, men of this world, the best of them contending for interests which pass away, the greater portion actuated, it is probable, merely by personal and selfish motives, assimilating to their own sordid purposes, as politicians in every age have so well contrived to do, the misdirected zeal and mistaken inter-suspensions of religious men; and engulfing questions of eternal truth, and interests of eternal duration, in the turbid, nay, sanguine whirlpool of secular convulsion. How slow are we to learn that the kingdom of Christ is not of this world, and that while we give to Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's, we are responsible to God for the things which are God's!

Through these unhappy events, the Arminian party, whose return and re-appearance were connived at by the Government on the gradual subsiding of civil commotion, have ever since constituted a separate ecclesiastical community; and the revocation of the Edict of Nantes by Lewis XIV. in 1688, having occasioned the settlement of great numbers of his Protestant refugee subjects in the United Provinces, the Reformed Church in that country may be represented as henceforth consisting of three distinct bodies, the Dutch reformed, the French reformed, and the Remonstrant communions.

These are, however, by no means the only religious parties which exist in Holland; and having followed, as some may think, our own partialities, in tracing, to the abuse of political power, the rise of two of the three already mentioned, it is but fair candidly to notice those which have had their origin in other causes. Of these, some are to be ascribed to those noble principles of religious freedom by which the Dutch republic was so long distinguished, and which have not only afforded protection and equality of civil rights, to those who, since the Reformation, have clung to the religion of their forefathers, but have conceded the same also to foreigners, who have brought with them the religion of their country. Thus, multitudes of German settlers, prompted by commercial enterprise to exchange a poorer for a wealthier land, have been permitted to import and retain their Protestantism according to the doctrine and ritual of the Lutheran Church; and, as we have already noticed, not a few of our own British sufferers for conscience' sake sought and obtained a refuge in Holland, during the arbitrary reigns of Elizabeth and of the Stuarts, and founded churches, of which some remain even to this day. Several religious bodies have sprung up among the Dutch themselves, some proceeding from that exercise of conscience which is inseparable from the use of the great Protestant principle of pri-

vate judgement in religion; to which class we must refer the Mennonites or Anabaptists, who were among the first Protestants that appeared in Holland; others, from that sense of duty which will not suffer men of real religion to look on unconcerned, when the fundamental principles of Christianity appear, in the communions to which they belong, either to be made a sacrifice to the usurpations of spiritual tyranny, or to be yielded as a prey to the vital-gnawing inroads of infidelity. To this latter sense of duty we must ascribe that separation among the naturalized Lutherans, out of which the so called Restored Lutheran Church arose in 1791; to the former, the origin and continuance of the Jansenist section of the Roman Church. One singular denomination, the *Christo Sacrum*, as it is called, owes its birth, we can hardly say growth or strength where there is neither, to a possibly well-meant, though inconsistent and chimerical endeavour to unite all parties and all confessions in one communion of religious worship. Before entering further into the survey of the principles or of the actual condition of these different bodies, we cannot forbear remarking, what a monument of real and permanent glory is reared by their existence, to the paternal mildness and civil and religious freedom of the Dutch republican government. Nor can we, at any hazard of misconstruction, suppress the utterance of our deep regret, that the present King, in many respects so estimable, should have exhibited such undeniable indications of his determination to bring all denominations, without exception, under *felt* political control, and to force, after the baleful example of his Prussian brother, the most discordant elements of religious feeling into ill-assorted and heart-revolting union.

The distinguishing principles of the several denominations which have been mentioned, and their present actual condition, so far as they are not matter of general knowledge, we shall explain as much as possible, through the medium of Mr. Fliedner; confining ourselves to such information as, to the best of our knowledge, is not accessible through other works. With regard to the dispute between the Gomarists and Arminians on the doctrines of grace, we may, without impropriety, remind those who are but little familiar with church history, that this is not to be confounded with the Calvinistic controversy as it now exists. The principles of neither party in that dispute correspond exactly to those to which the epithets Calvinistic and Arminian are applied in the present day. Moderate or Modern Calvinism, as it is frequently called, (by far the most prevailing form, as we conceive, in which the doctrines of that system are now maintained,) according to the exhibition of its principles in the writings of Mr. Fuller and Mr. Scott, its two most distinguished popular advocates, and the celebrated 'Defence' of Dr.

Williams, which may be very fairly represented as its most able scientific exposition, has, in one striking particular at least, receded from the system of Gomarus in the direction of his opponent's views: while Arminians generally, as we are informed, though differing very largely among themselves, have, in several respects, taken their stand upon much lower ground than that occupied by their distinguished leader; not a few of them, or at least of persons who are so classed, having even descended into Pelagian errors from which Arminius himself was very far removed. Those readers who are desirous of understanding thoroughly the original grounds of this dispute, we cannot do better than refer to the account which Professor Moses Stuart of Andover, U.S., has so carefully and ingenuously given of it, in the first volume (that for 1831) of Dr. Robinson's *Biblical Repository*.

I. The constitution and objective creed of the Dutch reformed, or old Established Church, notwithstanding the ordinance of 1816, by which the King sanctioned certain modifications introduced by an ecclesiastical commission of the preceding year, continue in most particulars the same that they originally were. The decisions of the synod of Dort remain still unrepealed, and the Heidelberg Catechism constitutes an acknowledged symbol of belief. The Presbyterian system of government by representation also abides in its full force, through the medium of church sessions, classical directions, provincial directions, and the general synod; which correspond very nearly to the Kirk-session, presbytery, synod, and general assembly of the Church of Scotland, and supply, as they do, courts of successive appeal and revision. The principal difference which, upon the face of Mr. Fliedner's representation, is obvious in the government of the two churches, consists perhaps in the paucity of lay elders in the Dutch Church; an arrangement which contrasts very disadvantageously with that which obtains in Scotland. The activity of the general Synod, on the other hand, in the restorative arrangements which had been rendered necessary by the troubles of the successive civil revolutions, deserves the warmest commendation. These are described as containing regulations—

- ‘ 1st. For the examination and licensing of candidates for the work of the ministry.
- ‘ 2dly. For the expenses of the classical directions.
- ‘ 3dly. For religious instruction.
- ‘ 4thly. For the visitation of church members.
- ‘ 5thly. For the supply of vacancies, and the calling and dismissal of ministers.
- ‘ 6thly. For the exercise of ecclesiastical superintendence and discipline.
- ‘ 7thly. For the construction and effectiveness of the church sessions.

‘ 8thly. For the administration of the church funds, and the expenses of divine service. This regulation is prepared with special reference to the circumstances of each particular province.

‘ 9thly. For a general widow’s-fund.’ Vol. II. pp. 29, 30.

We have stated above, that the decisions of the synod of Dort, and the Heidelberg catechism, retain their binding power in the Dutch reformed church. The whole truth, however, requires that our readers should be made more fully acquainted with the terms of the first of these regulations, in reference to the subscription required of ministerial candidates to the acknowledged symbols of the church. It is as follows :

‘ We, the undersigned, admitted, by the provincial direction of —, to the ministerial office in the reformed church of the Netherlands, hereby sincerely declare that we will carefully lay to heart, the advancement, by life and doctrine, of the interests both of Christianity in general, and of the Netherland Reformed Church in particular ; that we conscientiously and cordially embrace and believe the doctrine which, *agreeing with God’s Holy Word*, is contained in the recognized symbolical books of the Netherland Reformed Church ; that we will diligently teach and defend the same ; and that we will, with all zeal, apply ourselves to the furtherance of religious knowledge, and of Christian morality, order, and harmony ; obliging ourselves by this our subscription, to all the premises ; and in case we shall be found to have transgressed any part of this declaration and engagement, to submit ourselves to the decisions of the competent ecclesiastical conventions.’ Vol. II. pp. 30, 31.

The student of church history will be reminded, by this document, of the older controversies respecting *quod* and *quatenus*. There is no doubt that it was intentionally framed in this way, in order to facilitate the admission of those to whom the decisions of the synod of Dort had made the door too strait. We shall have further proofs of this, when we come to speak of the afternoon catechisings in the church. The history of the separation between the *evangelical* and the *restored* Lutherans will also afford evidence to the same effect.

The examination of candidates, which, according to this first regulation, takes place before the provincial direction, is charged by Mr. Fliedner with lying open to three exceptions.

‘ 1st. It is too short. The rule is, that, without reckoning the trial sermon, it shall last at least two hours. [We suppose in reference to each student, which would still, as Mr. Fliedner urges, be inadequate.]

‘ 2dly. That the candidates are not obliged to make any trial of their ability in catechizing children : and

‘ 3dly. That the examination takes place before ministers exclusively.’ Vol. II. p. 32.

These particulars are each deserving of attention, in reference to the passing of trials by theological students, in contemplation of ministerial engagements. With regard to the third exception, Mr. Fliedner states, that experience had made it clear, in the Rheno-Prussian provinces, before the revision of their church constitution, that the examination of candidates before ministers exclusively, was, owing to their preponderant occupation in practical duties, ordinarily too lax in its scientific requisitions,—a feature which could not but be injurious to the ends of theological study; while, on the other hand, that before professors, or, as he terms them, the book-learned only, as established in many countries, is equally deficient. Both disadvantages are, as he thinks, very happily obviated, in the examinations of the province of Westphalia, which take place at Münster, before a number of consistorial counsellors, (who are usually, if not always, distinguished professors of theology, honoured with this title by the king,) assisted by perhaps an equal number of experienced ministers, deputed for the purpose by a provincial synod. Two things are at least certain; that such examinations ought in no case to be considered as things to be perfunctorily hurried over, and that the union of the scientific and the practical should be as much as possible secured.

II. Passing over what further concerns the Dutch Reformed Church, till we consider the arrangements of divine service, our attention is next arrested by Mr. Fliedner's account of the Walloon or French Reformed. This differs from the Dutch Church, into whose classes it, as well as the English and Scotch presbyterian churches, is now incorporated, principally, if not entirely, through its retaining the use of the French language in divine service, and that of the Geneva Catechism in preference to the Heidelberg. The congregations in this communion amounted, in 1688, to no fewer than sixty-two, but are now reduced to nearly a third of that number.

III. What we have said of the constitution of the *Reformed* churches, applies, with almost equal truth, to that of the so called *evangelical* Lutheran communion. This also is under presbyterian representative government, according to a new constitution, sanctioned by the King in 1818; and the formulary of subscription to the Lutheran symbolical books is drawn up with the same laxity as that of the Reformed. It has, in all, fifty-seven congregations, with the same number of ministers. The whole amount of members is 47,000. The principal congregation is at Amsterdam, consisting of 22,000 souls, under the care of five ministers. Those at the Hague and Rotterdam are each computed to contain 3000 souls, and are supplied by three ministers each. The principal event which distinguishes the history of this communion, is the separation, to which we have already referred, of a considerable por-

tion of the Amsterdam congregation, on account of the prevailing neology. The statement of this transaction given by our Author, is in many respects instructive. If, in the complaint of the dissatisfied members, an undue degree of authority should seem to be ascribed to the symbolical books*, let it be remembered, that the ministers were charged with preaching doctrines totally subversive of those, upon the profession of which they had been admitted into their office. Should any think that the inspired Scriptures do not speak out with the same decision as the symbolical books, on every one of the points involved in the complaint, this doubt has still nothing to do with the terms of the dissatisfaction. The neological clergy were charged with departing from the recognized symbols of the church; and it is as obvious that they had departed

* As the terminology of theological literature is of course not so familiar to many of our general readers, who yet may take an interest in the subject of this Article, as it is to divines themselves, it may perhaps be interesting to observe, that the appellative, symbol and the epithet, symbolical, are, in Continental theology, continually applied to such documents as are understood to contain those statements of ecclesiastical doctrine which are accredited by the representatives or rulers of a church. This language arose, we believe, from the ancient but absurd tradition, that the first, or, as it is termed, the Apostles' creed, originally consisted (for its present is an altered form) of twelve Articles, of which each of the Apostles furnished one. It is thus a derivation from *συν* and *βαλλω*. The particular symbolical books of the Lutheran Church are as follows:—

1. The Augsburg or Augustan Confession, presented to the emperor, Charles the Fifth, at Augsburg, in 1530, by the Protestant States of Germany. It is a digest of early Lutheran principles, drawn up by Melancthon, under the direction of the great Reformer himself.
2. The Defence of this Confession, written by Melancthon, in answer to the "Refutation" attempted by the principal Catholic divines. The date of this Defence is 1531.
3. The Articles of Smalcald, prepared by Luther, and completed by Melancthon's "*Tractatus de Potestate et Primatu Papæ*." They were published in 1538.
4. The larger and smaller Catechisms.
5. The Formula of Concord, which, after having occupied the attention of the most distinguished theologians of Germany, Andreæ, Chemnitz, Chytræus, and others, for several years, in its composition, was at last published, with the authority of the Saxon Elector, in 1580. Very interesting notices of the state of parties, at the time of its composition, may be obtained from Dr. Pusey's "Historical Enquiry into the probable Causes of the Rationalist Character lately predominant in the Theology of Germany"; especially the second volume; and from an extended note of Professor Stuart to an Article furnished by him last July to the "Biblical Repository and Quarterly Observer", published at Boston, U.S., on the "Obedience of Christ."

from the simplicity which is in Christ. But their ecclesiastical engagements had no more power over these dishonest men than they have had on multitudes similarly situated, in our own country. The truth of God would be most wretchedly defended and upheld, if it had no other safeguard than creeds of human manufacture and of human imposition. But let the reader judge.

‘This separation’, says our Author, ‘is not only an important feature in the ecclesiastical history of Holland, but the causes which produced it form so instructive a contribution to the universal history of the evangelical faith, that a brief representation of it here cannot be out of place.’

‘Hardly had unbelief, about the middle of the last century, begun to prevail in the universities of Germany, and found its way into the German churches, before the Lutheran church of Holland was made sensible of its poisonous breath; for, having no seminaries of their own for the education of their ministers, they were necessarily supplied by divines who had studied in that country. In the beginning of 1780, it became apparent that three of the six ministers who presided over the Lutheran congregation at Amsterdam, had imbibed the new light and new wisdom of the rationalist theology, and that, though they had sworn to the symbolical books of their church, and, among others, to the Augsburg Confession, as their rule of doctrine, they were nevertheless endeavouring, with great zeal, both in their preaching and catechisings, to introduce neologian sentiments in direct contradiction to them. Although in the commencement this was attempted with some degree of circumspection, it nevertheless did not escape the observation of many faithful members of the congregation, whose anxiety increased the more, as the boldness of the innovators, and their prejudicial influence over the congregation, gained strength every year.’

‘At the end of the year 1786, therefore, one hundred and twenty-six members of the congregation presented an address, through four deputies, to the Consistory, in which they preferred thirteen charges of unsound doctrine against the three above mentioned ministers. That they seldom or never spoke of the holy Trinity, of the divinity of Christ, or of his meritorious sufferings, but explained away the proof scriptures upon these heads of doctrine; that they were silent upon Christ’s perfect obedience, representing him constantly as merely sent by God to communicate a moral system to man; and, although the Word of God and the symbolical books most clearly taught that man could be justified and rendered happy only for the sake of Christ’s eternally efficacious merits, and only through faith in Him, declared that works were capable of contributing to the same end. That they spared no pains to explain away the existence and influence of Satan, representing his name merely as a term significative of peculiar diseases, notwithstanding the direct opposition of Holy Scripture and the symbolical books to any such doctrine. That they invariably preached discourses on moral duties, accompanied with exhortations to the practice of virtue, but without pointing to the only real source of virtue, without any mention of saving faith, or the gracious operations of the Holy Spirit, except sometimes in such a way that the hearer

would only understand by faith an historical assent to Christian doctrine in general.

‘By desire of the Consistory, the deputies, a short time after, delivered in written testimonies upon the respective charges, in answer to which the three accused ministers put in their defence. During the time that the Consistory was engaged in carefully weighing against each other the opposing testimonies which had been delivered to them, the accused, with their friends, made every effort to withdraw the determination of the case out of the hands of the Consistory, and bring it before a meeting of the people. This they did, notwithstanding such a proceeding was opposed to church order, under the conviction that in that case they would be acquitted.

‘In this they succeeded, in May, 1787, and were fully acquitted. Dissensions, however, rose to a still greater height in the congregation, to which perhaps the political troubles of the time contributed. At length, a protest against the decision of the meeting, signed by more than 2000 members, having remained sometime fruitless, and the places of two faithful ministers, who had died in the meantime, having been filled up by two neologian preachers, so that but one faithful minister remained, and he advanced in years, a large portion of the congregation saw no other means of preserving the preaching of the pure faith, and instruction in sound doctrine among themselves and their children, without taking the extreme step of separating from the old congregation, and forming a new Lutheran communion.

‘This took place in February, 1791 when, after permission obtained from the Government, two ministers were invited; the faithful aged minister who has been mentioned, Hamelau by name, and one named Scholten from Rotterdam. They published a small pamphlet in defence of the measure they had adopted; and their numbers increased so rapidly, that, in 1792, they were able to invite a third minister.

‘The Christian spirit of the congregation manifested itself continually in such liberal subscriptions, bequests, and donations, to which many of the Reformed even contributed, that, in the year 1793, their large and beautiful church [at Amsterdam] was already consecrated. Below the pediment is inscribed, in golden letters, the text of the first sermon which their aged pastor, Hamelau, preached to them in the place: Acts ii. 42. **THEY CONTINUED STEADFASTLY IN THE APOSTLES’ DOCTRINE.**’ Vol. I. pp. 96—100.

Long may this inscription continue, as we understand it yet does, to represent the fact. We cannot forbear reverting for a moment to one of the circumstances mentioned in the preceding narrative; we mean the appeal, on the part of the accused ministers, to the voice of a majority. On the principle of a general consent in doctrine between ministers and people being highly necessary to the usefulness of the former, this measure may perhaps appear fair and commendable in its intention, if not strictly justifiable by the constitution of the church. But this point of view does not embrace the *gist* of the question at issue. We

concede the *apparent* fairness of an appeal to the congregation; nay, that it is the right and duty of churches, as well as of individuals, especially in times of advancing light, if such appear to have arrived, to subject their respective systems of faith, order, discipline, and practice, to the test of the inspired Scriptures, with a view to rectify not only abuses which have unobserved crept in, but original errors of their constitution. This we fully admit; and it would give us heartfelt pleasure to know that our respected Christian brethren, the Society of Friends, invited to it as they are by the present schism in their body, were prepared to do so. But can it be pretended that the course adopted by the accused ministers in the above instance, is a case of this kind? The appeal here lay purely upon points of doctrine; there was no question whatever of discipline or order: these, therefore, should have been carefully observed. Now it is not, as we believe, the custom of any one Presbyterian church in being,—certainly it never was of the Lutheran church,—to submit doctrinal questions to the decision of a majority of lay representatives or elders, much less a majority of the communion at large. In Scotland the Presbytery, in Holland the classical direction, is the lowest court before which such questions can be brought. Why then did not the accused ministers, who never pretended any dissatisfaction with the order of their church, leave the decision of the present question to the recognized authority? For two reasons. They knew that the standards of the church, when fairly confronted with their modern innovations, would efficiently assert, before a learned, reflective, and unbiassed presbytery, or classical direction, their relative superiority as forms of Christian doctrine; while, on the other hand, the comparative ignorance which is ever found in promiscuous multitudes, joined to the bustle, noise, and tumult of popular deliberations *on any extended scale*, were circumstances particularly favourable to the activity of the partizans whom, for a course of years preceding the crisis then brought on, they had been secretly engaging in favour of changes which they had “privily brought in unawares”. Disingenuous tamperers with doctrines they had themselves subscribed to, and of the rectitude of which they were *officially* exemplars, they concealed their departure from the recognized standards of the church they professed to serve, till the success of their insinuations with the ignorant, the careless, the scheming, and the unprincipled, and their double dealing with the steady, the reflective, and the pious, enabled them to throw off, as a yoke, the authority both of the standards and the courts to which they had subscribed obedience, and to lay all order and all truth at the feet of a tumultuous assembly. And for what object did they appeal? To procure the revision of the standards, and their adaptation to the new light? No: this would have been too

straight-forward and too bold a course for such thorough-going underminers : all they thought of was to obtain the sanction of a majority to their innovations, the inconsistency of these with the standards creating no concern ; while the latter were still honoured with the *form* of subscription, the question of the binding power of this act being left to the conscience of each individual subscriber. Thus was introduced into the Dutch Lutheran church a system of trifling with the most solemn obligations, which, we sincerely grieve to say, has been the blot and the bane of all established churches, as well as of some that are not established ; a system of prevalent and legalized dissimulation, which should for ever shut the mouths of all involved in it, against disparaging the *Monita Secreta* of the Jesuits.

Other questions arise out of the preceding narrative ; such as,—Supposing the assembly constitutionally convened, and the decision that of a majority entitled to decide, as such, on the doctrine they preferred to hear, whether of the two parties had the better title to buildings and funds which had been erected and contributed for the religious and charitable objects of the Lutheran church, as represented in its symbolical books ? But upon these points we cannot dwell. We pass on to observe that the *restored* Lutheran congregation at Amsterdam numbers at this time 9000 souls, and that they have eight or nine congregations in other towns. Since the new organization of the evangelical Lutheran church, as it is called, in 1817, and the meeting of their synod in 1819, several attempts have been made to win them back to the old communion, but unsuccessfully, through the continuance of the original reasons of secession. The following declarations and extract from the last letter addressed by the Restored Church to the synod, will serve, we hope, to set the spirit and principles of the former in their true light.

‘ Also they knew how to distinguish between points of doctrine of less and greater weight, and could separate solitary, abstract, speculative truths, as well as fruitless and curious questions, from those principal matters with which Christianity stands or falls. They regarded certain differences with respect to the former, as so many humbling proofs of human infirmity, from which they saw that the greatest church reformers, Luther, Zuingle, Melancthon, and Calvin, were not exempt ; and considered it therefore unsuitable to elevate declarations of such comparatively small importance into terms of church communion. But among these they could never class those fundamental truths of the Gospel which stand in immediate connexion with the doctrine of salvation. Without a cordial agreement in these great principles, they held an outward union to be in the highest degree injurious. What confusion would it not produce in a religious community, when one teacher should acknowledge and preach Jesus as

truly God, while another should represent him as a mere creature ; if, while one should exhibit his death as a real atoning sacrifice for sin, another should rise up and deny it !

‘Let men henceforward,’ concludes their letter, ‘condemn us as they will, because we are constrained to insist on the conditions we have urged, as though we had broken off these conferences from a disinclination to peace: the testimony of our conscience is, that purely out of a genuine Christian desire for peace, and in order to effect a lasting union, we have stipulated for a previous consent in fundamental principles as an indispensable condition. We lay the greatest stress on an agreement with respect to the method of salvation ; and by this we desire constantly to abide, though by so doing we should continue to experience the world’s hatred. Many an unlovely and persecution-breathing judgment has been passed upon us by our adversaries, notwithstanding all their boast of moderation ; in this, however, we have not imitated them, but have committed our cause to “Him who judgeth righteously.”

‘Though now condemned by many through ignorance or prejudice, we shall one day be seen in our true light, when outward appearances shall cease to misrepresent the true nature of our case ; and we look with longing desire towards a happier futurity, such as is promised to the church of God on earth. Should this still tarry, then hope we in eternity itself to secure the “reward of grace” which Christ himself has promised to his faithful servants, an over-recompense for all the misconceptions and hatred of the world.’ Vol. I. pp. 104—6.

“Here is the faith and patience of the saints.” It is indeed an example well adapted to make a deep impression, and affords a powerful living testimony to the reality and efficacy of renewing grace. Many of our readers will be glad, though not surprised, to be informed that, with that harmony of character which exalted Christianity produces, they have nobly declined all Government aid in respect of the support of their ministers, the construction of their churches, or the expenses of their religious worship ; delicately feeling, that, as the wish has been expressed in high quarters, that they should be re-united to the evangelical church, the acceptance of such aid would operate indirectly to the prejudice of their dearest interests, and of the principles for which it is their honourable duty to contend.

IV. The next section of the Church which calls for our attention, is that of the Mennonites, Baptists, or Anabaptists, as they are diversely called. Of these, there were, as is well known, many parties, even in the times of the Reformation ; and the denomination appeared in Holland under various leaders. Most of their original differences, however, have been long since obliterated ; and no further distinction now remains than that of the old Fleming Baptists, of whom but three congregations exist. One long enduring division, which arose in 1662, through the perversion of doctrine introduced by Galenus Abrahams de Haen, one of their

ministers at Amsterdam, was, at the close of the last century, suppressed, sad to say, through the defection of the followers of his faithful opponent, Samuel Apostool, from the better cause. Both parties are now united in unbelief. A purer spirit of religion still survives, however, in the old Fleming Baptist churches, the feeble remnant of a once numerous and flourishing body. The two other parties, on their coalition in 1800, protested against the name of Mennonites, expressing at the same time their unwillingness to be any longer called after man. The memory of Menno is honoured by this renunciation of his name. Those who think that his followers have withdrawn from him to get nearer to Christ Jesus, will of course extend the benefit of this remark to them *.

The history of this body suggests a lesson of no small importance to the Congregational and Baptist churches in this country, and speaks out, with a clear voice of warning, in reference to two errors, which we fear have obtained fast and frequent hold of the minds of the less instructed in both communions. The church constitution of the Mennonites, (we give them, for convenience, their historic name,) approximates very nearly to that of these two bodies: their congregations are independent on any other ecclesiastical authority than that of their own ministers and deacons; they are unsupported by the State; and they are presided over by ministers of their own choice, of whom some have qualified themselves for the work by such means as have fallen within their power, others have enjoyed a regular education in some theological seminary. Lay elders are not in use. The minister is assisted in the oversight of the church, by deacons,

* Writing, as it happens, at a distance from our books, we are glad of the opportunity afforded by the occurrence of the following passage in a note to p. 165 of Mr. Fliedner's first volume, to give our readers a specimen of Menno's theology. It is an extract from his treatise on Justification, and may serve as a measure of the distance which his followers have proceeded in the downward road. 'All those who thus receive Christ Jesus into a believing heart, and hold him fast in the treasury of a good conscience, [or, of their conscience,] who believe and acknowledge that it is through his sacrifice, death, and blood, that their sins are forgiven them, &c., [or, that their sins are forgiven them through his sacrifice, death, and blood;—the brevity of the extract will not permit us to see certainly where the emphasis of the original lies,] all such become joyful and happy in spirit, and thank God with a new heart. For the strength of faith impresses and changes them, and transforms them into new men, so that they walk, through the gift and grace of the Holy Spirit, in the strength of the new birth, according to the measure of their faith, in obedience to God, who has bestowed upon them such rich love,' &c. *Treatise on Justification*, p. 12; Works, (folio,) p. 462.

whose number varies according to the size of the congregation, there being six in that at Saardam, in that at Haarlem twelve, and twenty in that at Amsterdam. In some congregations, they are appointed for life; in others, for from four to five years. Their duties professedly concern the spiritual and temporal welfare of the congregation; and in the choice of a new minister, when of course their influence and recommendation have great weight, they are assisted, in those congregations where deacons are appointed for a season only, by all who have formerly filled that office. In all congregations, matters of importance must be submitted to a meeting of all who are in communion. The minister presides in all deliberations, but has nothing to do with financial arrangements, which, with the temporal care of the poor, is left entirely to the deacons.

We recognise in this account the main features of the congregational order of church government; one which, by its adherents in this country, is often fondly supposed to present a peculiar security against doctrinal and other declensions. Let the history of the Mennonite churches dispel this delusion; which arises, as is evident upon analysis, from the combination of two distinct errors, the one referring to the theoretical, the other to the practical perfection of the system. The former takes for granted the vast superiority of Congregationalism in reference to the security afforded by it *when efficiently worked out*: the latter grounds the idea of this superiority on the supposed fact, that the system possesses some peculiarly efficacious preventive safeguard against a departure from its fundamental principles. Equity and the interests of religion require an examination of both opinions. We think that, in the former, we detect an error of exaggeration; and holding, as we firmly do, that even if every particular of that system is not expressly sanctioned by the authority of Scripture, still, the requisitions of the New Testament in reference to church order are most nearly complied with on the principles of Congregationalism,—we yet maintain that, in order to a fair and accurate comparison of advantages, we must also take into consideration what Presbyterianism and Diocesan Episcopacy are capable of effecting, if properly worked out upon their respective principles, under the government of men of real and fervent piety, uncontrolled by state alliances or secular authority. We believe that comparatively few among us, and by no means a majority among themselves, are aware in how close a relation to the purest objects of Christianity these two great sections of the Church might take their stand, if all were separated from their respective constitutions, that has been mischievously and confusedly incorporated with them, by the selfish assumptions of secular power ‘intruding into things which it hath not seen.’ Such Presbyterianism exists in Scotland, and on a small scale in England, free from

State shackles, and from the corrupting influence of the law and custom of patronage. And Episcopacy, even diocesan, though the immoderate extent and injudicious allotment of dioceses are among the evils resulting immediately or remotely from the objects of state influence, is capable, as America demonstrates, of existing without prelacy,—without those exactions and that arrogance which result from her pretensions here (alas, how baseless and absurd !) to nationality. Thus delivered from disturbing influences, we recognise in Presbyterianism and Episcopacy, much of that simple decency and order of the New Testament which we search for in vain amidst the ‘carnal ordinances,’ the ‘rudiments of the world’, whereby both our British Establishments of religion are disfigured. And while we claim for Congregationalism, (we trust without offence, since we concede to others the same right of holding and avowing their respective preferences,) as an institute of the New Testament, or as at least a system which makes the most effectual provision, for the spirit and observances of primitive Christianity—that it bears, unquestionable marks of Divine wisdom in the adaptation of its form and order to the last and highest ends of true religion, and on this account is worthy to be cherished with all affection by us, and transmitted with all possible purity to future generations ;—we feel at the same time under equal obligation, to recognise in other systems the elements of good which they possess in common with us ; to follow any advantage which they may have obtained over us, with regard to any particular interpretation of the Christian rule, or any purer exemplification of the Christian spirit ; and to acknowledge, with satisfaction unalloyed by any selfish feeling, every mark of their identity with the one true Church of the living God. We fear that this is by no means adequately acted out ; and that an undue estimate of our *superiority in principle*, not only betrays its influence in decreasing our regard for other denominations, but also operate very injuriously in many instances upon our own practical efficiency. Can it be doubted, either in reference to individuals or to churches, that in cases where conscience is sufficiently alive to the concerns of duty, to bring different parties into any thing resembling a conformity either to each other or the inspired standard, the more doubtful points of difference which yet remain, are as nothing in comparison with their substantial agreement ? Surely, their relative position in the eye of their common Master, is decided, not upon any approximation to the theoretic standard, resulting from the perhaps accidental maintenance of some principle which other good men doubt, but by that spirit and habit of obedience out of which all good conduct springs. There are very many minor questions, we are sure, both of arrangement and discipline, to which the often quoted, and often misquoted rule may safely be applied ; ‘That which is best ad-

‘ministered,’ i. e. that in whose administration is exemplified the greatest spirit of obedience, ‘is best.’

The second error, which supposes to possess Congregationalism, some peculiarly efficacious *preventive* safeguard against a departure from its fundamental principles, is powerfully exposed, and shewn to be an error, not of exaggeration merely, but of principle, by the mournful fact to which we have adverted. That which we feel to constitute the glory of our system, purity of communion, was once the privilege of these congregations. This, so long as it is preserved, may be indeed regarded as the Palladium of faith and piety; but what is the Palladium with respect to it? The holy likeness of the King of saints, impressed upon his people’s hearts by his own Spirit, and reflected not in private life alone, but in their communion for the purposes of mediatorial grace and power, is *itself* the divine, the heaven-descended image which, so long as it is guarded with due care, seals the security of a Christian church. But, as this living holiness is no mechanical production, so is neither the church catholic which comprises all that is to be found of it on earth, nor any particular church which is congenially attracted, and ‘fitly joined together and compacted’ by it, a mere mechanical arrangement. The Church is an organic product of the Spirit; and without his special influence, no form or order—a mere fraction of the system of means—can generate life, infuse health, or sustain the capacities of growth and action. And though we do not overlook, (what indeed it becomes us with unfeigned humility and heartfelt gratitude to recognize,) the peculiar efficacy which the holy scriptures ascribe to one special provision in the order of means, we mean supplicatory prayer, as able to ‘prevail with God;’ yet must we not conceive of this as though it infringed in even the smallest measure upon the sovereignty of God’s ‘free spirit.’ We rather see its solution in the fact of an antecedent special gracious inclination of the Spirit in the inspiration of such prayers, (for ‘the fruit of the Spirit’ is in ‘all prayer’) and in the peculiar cordiality of His condescension in relation to those postures of dependent humanity, which are most expressive of helplessness and need. From the undue exaltation of any means, however, the Spirit in offended majesty withdraws. For he is an almighty, free, and sovereign agent, bound to no forms or methods, even when divinely authorized; though, in the exercise of his uncontrolled and mighty influence, every touch and every impulse whereby he moves in secret the subordinate mind of man, is a link in that chain whereby means and ends are bound in inseparable union in the fast decrees of God,—a step in the accomplishment of the everlasting covenant of grace and mercy. Therefore, so long as it is possible to ‘grieve’ or ‘to quench the Spirit,’ to ‘fall from grace,’ to ‘do despite unto the Spirit of

'grace,'—things referred to in the holy Scriptures, sometimes in the form of solemn warning, sometimes of historical description—we must allow it to be possible to incur religious depravation; which, whenever it becomes general in a church, no order of means has any inherent efficacy either to repair or to obviate. The inbred worm which has devoured the kernel, generally perforates the shell to eat his passage out; and, as no forms can shut out temptation, or effectually prevent the corruption of our nature from becoming manifest within the church, so, when abandoned by the insulted Spirit, they offer but little resistance to the innovations of wicked men, desirous of levelling all barriers which separate the church and the world. Thus has passed away the glory of the Mennonite communion; just as, in the primitive times of our religion, when the churches addressed in the Apocalypse had 'left their first love,' become indifferent to the hearing of Antichristian doctrine, retaining only the name, and not the power of life, and were 'neither cold nor hot,' He who walketh in the midst of the churches, came upon them in an hour which they knew not of, and removed their candlestick out of its place. These are warning facts of the intensest interest. Did we not know that the error just exposed prevails very largely, (owing probably to the fact, that, in our own country, declensions from Gospel purity have been incomparably more abundant in the Episcopal and Presbyterian communions than in our own,) we should not have occupied so large a space in its discussion. "Let him that thinketh he standeth, take heed lest he fall."

While the Baptist churches in this country possess an equal interest with the Congregational, as being in fact of the same order, in the warnings thus exhibited, they have it in their power to derive an additional lesson from the history before us. Upon the principles which they will feel entitled to apply to the case, they will at once perceive, that not even the peculiar distinction of a closer adherence to the Scriptures upon a matter of very great importance, and one on which they consider an immense majority of their Christian brethren to be still in error, furnishes an adequate preventive to declension. And if it be true, that, in cases where the differences of Christian denominations are confined in extremely narrow bounds, the existing point or points in dispute operate, especially among a minority whose interest is naturally keener, with an intenseness inversely proportioned to the space they cover, may we not hope that the circumstances which have originated the present digression, will have an influence in reducing, where it does exist, this exaggerated estimate of privilege to its proper limits?

We turn now to the more pleasant duty of noticing a feature in the external order of these congregations, which appears to us deserving of our imitation. We hope thus to furnish to any who

may have misunderstood the object of the preceding remarks, sufficient evidence that, while anxious to be on our guard against exalting the order above the spirit of Christianity, we are by no means indifferent to the former in subserviency to its proper ends.

‘Deaconesses are also still in use in these congregations. They are chosen by the minister and deacons, act under their sanction, and are entrusted with the care of the female poor. They visit their abodes, distribute the clothing which have been furnished for their relief, interest themselves in procuring suitable situations for girls intended for service, and discharge all such offices of charity as come fairly in their way. They receive no stipends, any more than the deacons; belong to the most respectable families in the Congregation; and discharge the various time-consuming and self-denying duties of their office with cheerfulness and zeal.

‘This praiseworthy, primitive institute is deserving to be imitated by other evangelical confessions. The Apostolical church early established the office of Deaconess, (Rom. xvi. 1,) well understanding that feminine tenderness and delicacy of feeling, and female tact in administering to the necessities of mind and body, especially among their own sex, could never be supplied by male attendance. Why has not the later church retained this apostolical arrangement? . . . Does not the experience of this our Sister-church*,—do not the female societies which have sprung up since the last years of the war,—does not the holy activity of an ELIZABETH FRY, and her sister-helpers in England, and that of the female societies which have been established in other lands, after their example, for the relief of the temporal and spiritual necessities of female prisoners,—all tend to shew how great the influence is which female piety may contribute to the edification of God’s kingdom, where it can find free room for its development and exercise? How erroneously and unwisely then do other evangelical communions act in this matter, in opening no regular, appointed circle of duty to this powerful engine, in the care of the poor, the sick, and prisoners of their own sex? To how many ladies, widows,—especially those of ministers and elder single ladies,—might a new, delightful field of duty thus be opened, to dry the tears of the mourners, bring female transgressors back again to the Saviour, and reclaim them to their path of duty in the world;—a work to enter upon which uncalled, the restraints of female modesty forbid?’

Vol. I. pp. 150—152.

* We are sorry to be compelled to protest against this recognition of the Mennonites, if intended to apply to them in their present state. Where there is no faith, there can be no church; and unbelief is, in this body, not merely a general, but a universal disease. On this account we have been careful, in reference to them, to translate the term ‘Gemeinde,’ which signifies Church as well as Congregation, invariably by the latter term.

In these remarks we fully agree; indeed, we have long been disposed to carry our views further than our Author has here done. He writes with reference to German ladies, who being in general far more occupied in domestic cares and duties than is usual in any except the lower classes in this country, have not that influence in society which is possessed by ladies in Great Britain, nor, generally speaking, either education to qualify them for it, or opportunity to acquire it. He would probably be satisfied with such ladies' societies as we already possess; but our desires stretch much further. We wish to see these female energies in more avowed and closer connexion with the Church of Christ, according to the primitive, apostolical model. We are not satisfied to see that done in separation from the Church, for which there is provision made in her original constitution. But this is not the fault of our female labourers. It is the duty of our churches, first, to make a point of engaging, with especial reference to the necessities of the female poor, the *regular* assistance of a sufficient number of Christian ladies who, being unburdened with domestic duties, have leisure to devote to it: (*such are never known to be unwilling; their hearts are ever open to the calls of charity:*) then to recognize them in the scriptural, official character connected with the department of duty they have undertaken; (*a character which there are very, very many, we are well persuaded, who would adorn with most exemplary diligence, simplicity, and tenderness;*) and thirdly, while the collection and general distribution of all monies would of course remain, as it has always done, with the male deacons, to place at their disposal such a portion of the means at command for charitable purposes, as upon a fair comparison of claims may seem to be proper, to enable them to execute the trust committed to them; the deacons either leaving to their own discretion as circumstances may direct, the specific distribution of these funds, or coupling the grant, in cases where it should seem preferable, with directions founded on the report received. How advantageously, again, on the supposition that these ladies would be most of them probably advanced or advancing in life, might a *dorcas* society of younger ladies be formed and sustained under their direction, with a view to aid their labours! With how much mutual advantage, especially to the younger ladies! Such of these as should afterwards marry, would, probably, while doing good for others, find that they had learned much that would be very useful to themselves; and for those who should continue single, the path would thus be opened, according to apostolical suggestion, (1 Cor. vii. 32, 34,) for more entire consecration to the service of the Lord. Three reasons have induced us to express our mind upon this subject. First, the arrangement is *scriptural*: the commendation in Rom. xvi. 1,

and numerous directions in the Epistles to Timothy and Titus *, illustrate the existence of the office of female deacons in apostolic times. Secondly, it gives *official* scope to female diligence, in connection with the Church of Christ, which has been expressly established by the Head of the Church as the proper fulcrum and centre of unwearied and combined exertion in his service “according to the effectual working in the measure of every part.” (Eph. iv. 16.) Thirdly, while the end is likely to be more judiciously pursued and more efficiently attained by this arrangement, it also avoids not only the ostentation and parade attendant on the efforts of secular or mixed societies, but all those disadvantages both to themselves and the cause of religion, which are connected with the *prominence* of persons distinguished by the vanities of worldly fashion, in appeals and labours peculiarly Christian. Let us, however, not be misunderstood; we mean not to advise the discontinuance of such societies as can be honourably conducted on the common principles of humanity, especially till we have something better in their place; but we are sure the pious Christian lady, unburthened with domestic cares, would be glad of, and must need, some purer, simpler, and more sacred path in which her noblest energies and tenderest feelings may be consecrated to her species and her God.

The Mennonite Congregations in general have no peculiar distinctive creed but what refers to the *subjects of baptism*,—and to *oaths*. As they deem all oaths inadmissible, even those which are merely declarative, they are dispensed from the obligation to take them by the civil government. Those who have been baptized as children in other churches, are baptized afresh on entering their communion. Mr. Fliedner has given us a very interesting description of their mode of administering this rite.

* The administration of baptism is not the same in all congregations. In that at Amsterdam, an intimation of the service is given out from the pulpit four weeks before; and those who desire to be baptized, are then requested to make their wishes known to the ministers. These lay their report weekly before their colleagues, where such exist, and the deacons. The profession of faith then takes place, either orally or by a written paper, in presence of two ministers or deacons and certain appointed witnesses, either at the residence of the person to be baptized or in the vestry. Special witnesses are in use only at Amsterdam; and their duty is, on the candidate's profession of faith, to bear

* See 1 Tim. iii. 11, v. 2, 9, Tit. ii. 3. If any reader is in doubt upon these passages, let him ask some competent scholar, or one who has an acquaintance with the customs of the primitive church, to explain them.

their testimony before the ministers or deacons who are present, to his moral and religious character. In all other congregations, it is usual, on the Sunday following the profession of faith, to read the names of the candidates from the pulpit, in order that, if any person has any objection to make to the baptism of any candidate, he may have an opportunity of doing it.

At Amsterdam, the spring baptism always takes place on the fifth Sunday in Lent. In the morning, a profession-sermon is preached, as it is called, in which a brief representation is made of the principal articles of belief, partly for the instruction of the whole congregation, but principally for the sake of the candidates; whose names, with those of the witnesses to their character, are read from the pulpit immediately after the sermon. This closes with an address to the candidates. The baptism itself takes place in the evening service. In most other congregations, baptism is administered on a Lord's-day morning. The candidates sit before the pulpit. After the short sermon and the hymn, the minister advances to the front of the pulpit, the candidates stand up, and the males come forward first. Then follows an address to all the candidates, grounded on the sermon, and afterwards the questions. There is no formulary for these; the minister frames them according to his pleasure. The following were given to me by a Mennonite minister as a fair sample of what they usually are.

1. Do you feel real sorrow for every thing by which, either in thought, word, or deed, you have offended God?

2. Do you believe in Jesus, as sent of God to reconcile the world unto himself, and do you flee to him in faith for the forgiveness of your sins?

3. Have you made up your mind, henceforth to walk after his example, and to remain true to him even until death?

4. Is it your wish, in confirmation of this engagement, to receive the sign and seal of holy baptism?—Vol. I. pp. 139, 140.

Our readers will certainly not detect in these questions, any indications of the misbelief which has been described as having overrun the Mennonite congregations; and some may probably feel tempted to suspect our worthy Author of a degree of misrepresentation. But all this is easily explained. Whatever words are used on such occasions, they will always be interpreted according to the general doctrine and specific explanation of the ministry, and the pervading spirit of the body. There is no greater mystery here, than is involved in the subscription, in many instances frequently repeated, by clergymen of Arminian or even Socinian views, to a body of Articles wherein it is declared, that the godly *consideration* of predestination and our election in Christ, is full of *sweet, pleasant, and unspeakable comfort* to godly persons, and such as feel in themselves the working of the Spirit of Christ, mortifying the works of the flesh and their earthly members, and drawing up their mind to high and heavenly things; as well because it doth greatly establish and con-

'firm their faith of eternal salvation to be enjoyed through Christ, 'as because *it doth fervently kindle their love towards God.*' (Art. XVII. of the Church of England.) The fact is as has been above explained, where the life of faith and real religion is departed,—though we do not say thus much of the English Episcopal Church, in whose revival, partial as it is, we unfeignedly 're-joice, yea, and will rejoice'; but where this is the case, the most impressive and the purest forms are almost as worthless as an abandoned snail shell, or the cast-off shrivelled skin of the fresh-clothed serpent. And yet, in one view they are better; for, should the Spirit breathe on these dry bones so that they should live, the skin might be resumed afresh. Mr. Flidner continues:

'The questions are not directed to individuals, but to all collectively, and are answered with a simple affirmative. All then kneel down together, when the minister offers up a prayer; after which he rises, and, accompanied either by his colleague [where the charge is collegiate] or a deacon holding the bason, he baptizes the still kneeling candidates. In doing this, he lays his left hand on the head of the baptized person, fills the palm of his right hand with water, and once, not three times, pours it forth upon the forehead; referring at the same time briefly to the contents of the questions, yet so varying his expressions that in every instance he concludes with these words:—"Therefore baptize I thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." When the rite is finished, he welcomes them, still kneeling, as new members of the Christian church, as brethren and sisters, and raises them individually by the hand. In some congregations, he merely invites them to rise up. In several of the smaller congregations again, a suitable portion of scripture is addressed to each individual as he is assisted to rise. After this welcome [or, as we should say, the giving of the right hand of fellowship,] follows a concluding address, in which they are invited to the communion of the Lord's Supper, after which every one returns to his place. The solemnity is concluded with prayer and psalmody.'—Vol. I. pp. 140, 141.

The above is the mode of administration among the Mennonites in general, from which that in use among the three surviving churches of the old Fleming Baptists differs very little. The principal distinction which obtains, is in the questions addressed to the candidate, which contain a more explicit reference to the doctrines of the Trinity, to the inspiration of the Scriptures, and to the divinity and offices of Jesus Christ; with an engagement to hold the 'unity of the Spirit' as expressed in their received confession, 'in the bond of peace'. The form employed on the actual administration is to the following effect:—

'On this thy confession of faith and acknowledgment of sins, coupled with thy hearty resolution, through the grace of God supporting thee, to turn from all unrighteousness, and give thyself up to God even our Saviour, with entire subjection of thy will to His; since it is thy desire hereupon to receive the baptism of water, so baptize I thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, and

wish that Christ himself may baptise thee with the Holy Spirit and with fire, and confirm thy acceptable resolutions by his grace.

Vol. I. p. 179.

It was formerly the custom of these churches to rebaptize even those who had received adult baptism in the Mennonite congregations, on their coming over to them; but this is no more done. In addition to Baptism and the Lord's Supper, they still continue to regard the 'washing of feet' as a sacrament, expressive 'of meekness and humility after the example of Christ,' and 'also as a sign and seal of purification from sin through the blood of Christ.' This, however, extends to two only of their three congregations. The officers in use among them are, bishops or elders, teachers or exhorters, deacons and deaconesses. Their bishops and teachers receive no academical education.

There formerly existed another class of Baptists in Holland, known by the name of *Collegiants*, or *Rynsburgers*; but these have been extinct some years. They acknowledged no distinction of ecclesiastical office, but every member was at liberty to preach and administer the sacraments. They were the only Baptists in the country who performed the rite by immersion; and Mr. Fliedner states, that, on a visit which he made to Rynsburg in 1823, he found their baptizing-house, as it was called, still in good condition. 'The baptistry itself was in the garden, a small four cornered basin with steps descending into it, by which the administrator of the rite went down with the receiver into the clear water, and immersed him once entirely.' The basin was then surrounded by a beautiful high box-hedge, but the whole of the buildings and garden have since been disposed of by public sale and broken up.

V. We now pass over to a widely different section of the visible Church; we mean the Jansenist communion, or, as it is otherwise called, 'the Church of Utrecht'. The origin of this party in the Church of Rome is of course well known to our studious readers, to whom also the history of their early sufferings in France will probably have been made familiar through the deeply interesting though garbled translations of Mrs. Schimmelpenninck. Mr. Fliedner has afforded some interesting details respecting the rise and proceedings of the party in Holland, from which we shall extract what is most essential; merely premising, for the information of the general reader, that they received the name of Jansenists from asserting the orthodoxy of Jansenius, Bishop of Ypres, in Flanders, in opposition to the Bull obtained by the Jesuits from Pope Alexander the VIIth, in 1665; whereby the celebrated work of the former, entitled 'Augustinus', and professing to contain a summary of the views of Augustine on the doctrines of grace, was condemned on the alleged fact of its containing five heretical propositions.

‘Codde, Archbishop of Utrecht, being disposed to side with them, was, in 1704, deposed by the Pope at the instigation of the Jesuits; this, however, did not prevent the cathedral-chapters at Utrecht and Haarlem from continuing to exercise their spiritual authority by means of vicars-general, though these of course were never recognized by the Pope. Although the chapter at Haarlem yielded in 1706 to intimidation, that at Utrecht not only continued firm, but in the year 1719 appealed, with a portion of the Haarlem clergy, to a general council; and in 1723, elected Cornelius Steenhoven as archbishop, who obtained his consecration at Amsterdam by the hands of the exiled Jansenist bishop Varlet. On the death of the latter in 1742, the then Archbishop of Utrecht, Meendaarts, restored the bishoprick of Haarlem, which had become extinct; and, in 1758, that of Deventer; in order that bishops might not be wanting for future consecrations. In 1763 he convoked a provincial synod.

‘According to the provisions of this synod, the “Church of Utrecht” separates herself in nowise from the Roman Catholic Church, or from obedience to the Pope as the visible vicar of Christ, and centre of Christian unity. Only she rejects the infallibility of both the Pope and the Church *in matters of fact, and such points as have no reference to Christian faith and practice*; appeals from the bull *Unigenitus* [issued by Pope Clement the XIth in 1713, principally against the French Jansenists,] to a general council; professes her attachment to the Augustinian doctrine with regard both to faith and morals; asserts the right inherent in the cathedral-chapter at Utrecht to elect their own bishop; and recognizes [in the spirit of Jansenius and Fenelon] the “inward service of God in the heart” as the principal expression of piety.

‘The Popes have continued all along to excommunicate the newly elected bishops, as well as the clergy and the people. The conferences commenced in 1823 with the papal nuncio, Nazalli, at the Hague, broke off without success, through his insisting on the acknowledgment of the bull *Unigenitus*, and an unconditional submission, as terms of reconciliation. The Bishop of Deventer and Archbishop of Utrecht, therefore, who were elected in 1825 under the royal sanction, have fallen equally with their predecessors under the ban of excommunication. On the other hand, these bishops, together with the Bishop of Haarlem, addressed, in Feb. 1826, a solemn declaration to all Archbishops, Bishops, Clergymen, and Laymen of Catholic Christendom, especially in the Netherlands, wherein they assert the justice of their cause; represent the unceasing oppression of the Court of Rome in respect to them; openly maintain the fallibility of the Pope, from the acknowledgments of Popes themselves, particularly those of Adrian the VIth.; call for brotherly mediation with the Romish chair, where, say they, too often Christ is condemned, and Barabbas set at liberty; but acknowledge at the same time their dependence on the same, and appeal to the next Ecumenical Council.’*

Vol. II. pp. 560—562.

* This declaration was published originally in Latin and French, and is also to be obtained in French, under the title, “*Declaration des*

On all occasions, however, they still continue to maintain, that they are part and parcel of the Roman Catholic Church; and their young people are instructed in both the larger and smaller catechisms which are in general use: only they have prepared a supplementary catechism of their own upon the points of difference, which has been issued by command of the archbishop and the two bishops. The points of difference are there reduced to three.

'The *first* consists in this; that the "Church of Utrecht" refuses to subscribe the condemnation of Jansenius by Pope Alexander the VIIth, on the ground that the five heretical propositions therein alleged, are not contained in Jansenius's book. Whether the latter taught these propositions or not, say they, is a *question of fact*. *In matters of fact, however, neither Pope nor Church is infallible. The Church is only infallible in such matters as relate to faith and morals.*

'The *second point of difference* respects the bull *Unigenitus*, which they refuse to acknowledge, because it condemns catholic verities which are grounded upon holy Scripture and the doctrine of the Church; e. g., that "faith is the first grace, and the spring of all other graces"; further, that "the Lord's-day should be kept holy by Christians through the reading of books of piety, and above all the holy Scriptures;" that "it is a sin to prevent a Christian from such reading," &c. This bull, also, they say, has never been authorized by a general council of the church, nor by any great portion of it, that is to say, after investigation of the matter by the principal bishops and doctors of the church of God. That, by one body of Catholics, it was accepted through the influence of the Jesuits; by another, from an undue reverence for the pope, because they erroneously imagined that the pope was infallible, and that implicit obedience was due to him; by a third party, from ignorance, &c.' pp. 11—19.

'The *third point of difference* relates to the rights of the "Church of Utrecht". The privilege of electing their bishops, which was first granted to the cathedral-chapter by the Emperor Conrad the IIIrd. in 1145, and afterwards confirmed by the Popes, was unjustly and in an unheard of manner attempted to be taken from them by the Pope in 1706. They contend, therefore, that the papal banns issued from time to time against their duly elected bishops were of no authority. (pp. 20, 21.) *That the Pope is to be obeyed in every thing which is not contrary to the law of God and the doctrine and standing rules of the church.* That the Catholic Church is infallible with respect to faith and morals, but that *the Pope is a fallible man*, as may be proved by numerous instances.' Vol. II. pp. 563—565.

Evêques de Hollande, adressée à toute l'Eglise Catholique, et Acté d'Appel, &c., à Paris, chez Policier et Moutardier, 1827." Prefixed is a brief history of the "Church of Utrecht", with original documents.

At the same time they acknowledge, that although the Pope should err in his decisions, true Catholics will not on that account feel themselves justified in withdrawing from his authority, but will still continue to honour and obey him as the head of the Church. On this point Mr. Fliedner adds :—

‘ At the same time she [the “ Church of Utrecht ”] teaches, that it is their duty to remain in union with the holy chair, [of St. Peter,] and that they do remain so united, because they hold the same faith, acknowledge the Pope as supreme head, obey him in all things *according to the rules of the Church*, pray for him, defend his rights, and remain in communion with other bishops and churches, which have preserved their outward union with the Pope.’ Vol. II. p. 565.

One short passage more will put us in possession of all that is further interesting enough to deserve extract in reference to this peculiar communion.

‘ In respect of worship, there is no essential difference between them and other portions of the Roman Catholic Church. The churches of the Jansenists are certainly more simple, and many of them have but *one* altar, although they might have several. There is preaching *every Sunday*. Baptism, the holy communion, and the visitation of the sick are administered by some of their clergy in the *Dutch* language ; by others, according to choice, in Latin. The prayers, however, are always offered in Latin.

‘ Their church discipline is, owing to the superior strictness of their moral and religious principles, also stricter than among other Catholics. They observe *the fasts*, for instance, more rigorously, abstaining from meat not only every Friday, but even every day throughout Lent.

‘ The Bible, and that in the Dutch translation of *VERSCHUUR*, is zealously disseminated by the Jansenists in their communion, although they do not stand in any regular connection with the Netherlands Bible Society.’

That they set general councils above the Pope, and profess other principles of the Gallican Church, is obvious from what has been already mentioned. Indeed, generally speaking, both the clergy and the laity in this communion are distinguished by a more liberal and a clearer way of thinking, and by greater peaceableness and obedience towards the Government, than other Catholics. They are also accustomed to a freer intercourse with Protestants.

It is computed that, in 1831, the Jansenist communion reckoned not quite 5000 souls, forming twenty-seven congregations, under the government of one Archbishop and two Suffragans. This is a considerable falling off from its condition even so recently as the year 1809, when it comprised thirty-three congregations, and

opens but a gloomy prospect for the future. The declension is ascribed by our Author to the inconsistency exhibited in their clinging to the infallibility of the Catholic Church on matters of doctrine, while disclaiming it on matters of fact; to their disputing the competency of the Church to decide whether certain doctrines are or are not contained in a certain book, and yet conceding the far more difficult function of deciding on the abstract truth of the doctrines themselves. The inconsistency evinced in their acknowledgement of continued allegiance to the Pope as Christ's Vicar upon earth and the centre of Christian Unity, even though he should be guilty of error and injustice, and yet persisting in a state of insubordination to him, is also considered by Mr. Fliedner as unfavourable to their prosperity. Whether these discrepancies have really so much weight as is here ascribed to them, we cannot say. It may, or it may not be so; though we rather think that other causes, of equal and perhaps greater influence, are in operation. It would appear that their principal losses are to the more regular Roman Catholic church, which also exists and is pretty numerous in Holland. In this case, it is probable that they arise rather from that *indifference* to the principles of their resistance, which would naturally creep in with the course of time, than from any *conviction of inconsistency* forced upon them by a more thorough sifting of its grounds; since, were the latter the cause, it seems at least probable, that while some might return to regular Catholicism, others would adopt what we consider the more reasonable alternative of asserting for their individual consciences, upon scripture authority, the right and duty of private judgement. But '*le vrai n'est pas toujours le vraisemblable,*' and our Author may have grounded his judgement upon facts he has not mentioned. We are much less concerned to prove that what we have above suggested is the case, than to urge upon our Christian readers of every denomination, the propriety and duty of prayer, on behalf of this conscientious body, that every remaining veil of error may be taken off their heart; and that they may be led onward by the Spirit into all that fulness of light and liberty which is the privilege of a redeemed and sanctified church. It merely remains to mention with respect to them, that they have a Theological Seminary at Amersfort, in which about twenty pupils prosecute their studies under direction of three professors.

We find that we must pass over the community entitled '*Christo sacrum,*' without the specific notice which we had designed to give it, since we could hardly attempt any additional delineation of its character, without extending our remarks to by far too great a length. Omitting this, therefore, we proceed at once to make as profitable a use as lies in our power of the interesting descriptions with which Mr. Fliedner has furnished

us of the ritual and other services of the Dutch reformed church. We had intended a comparative view of the religious services of all the denominations, but our limits render it impossible.

Our Author commences this account with a recital of the effect produced upon his mind by the stillness of a Sabbath in Holland; so different from what is common in his own country, where the pleasures of this world have claimed the Lord's day as peculiarly *their own*. He then gives the following description of the principal service, which takes place in the forenoon.

'The reader enters his desk at half past nine precisely, habited with cloak and band similar to those of the minister. He raises a psalm, in which all unite. After that, he reads with slow and solemn tone a section out of the Scripture, ordinarily one relating to the subject of the sermon. As he reads, the eyes of all are following him in the Bibles with which every one is furnished. Ten o'clock strikes. He immediately closes the book, and leads the psalm announced on the board, of which one verse only is then sung. The minister ascends the pulpit, having first offered a short, silent prayer on the lowest stair, and hangs his hat upon the pillar against which it stands. The psalm ceases. The minister then commences a short introductory prayer, usually an ascription of praise to God, or, it may be, a brief supplication for help and a blessing upon the preacher and the hearers. Then follow the introduction of the sermon and a prayer, ending frequently, but not always, with the Lord's Prayer. Another verse is now sung. After this the text is read, and a short benediction pronounced. Then follows the sermon itself, consisting usually of three parts; the exposition of the text, in its terms and connection with the foregoing and following context; then the statement and development of the subject or proposition; last of all, the application to the hearers. . . . This never lasts less than an hour, commonly an hour and a half, frequently two hours; but the attention of the hearers is wonderfully sustained till the close. The minister often has a glass of milk, or water, beside him, with which he occasionally moistens his dry mouth. If the sermon be unusually long, a verse is sung between the heads. At its close, the sexton brings him the notices, which he then gives out. After these, he offers the concluding prayers, which usually last half an hour, including supplications for the sick and for travellers, and thanksgivings on recovery, return home, and almost every conceivable occasion. When this is over, he gives out another hymn, sits down, and draws to the green curtains which enclose the pulpit on both sides. This, however, is not always done. After the singing of the hymn, the congregation is dismissed with a blessing, sometimes the Mosaic, but usually the Apostolic benediction.'

An admirable stillness frequently pervades the Dutch congregations, although the wearing of their hats by the male part of the audience, except during prayer, detracts very greatly, in the feeling of persons unaccustomed to it, from the decorum re-

quired by the occasion. There is also another difference from our own arrangements, which we have thought to be injurious to the full accomplishment of the great ends of worship; we mean the separation of the sexes, which, by rendering it impossible for families to sit together, deprives public worship of much of that powerful interest which it assumes when it is felt to be the crowning act of Christian communion. This feeling was provided for, with beautiful condescension to human sympathies, in the annual journeys of the Israelites to observe the national solemnities at Jerusalem; when single households, first uniting in the neighbourhood of their respective dwellings, then in the form of townships, blended in their progress with other townships, and these again forming themselves probably, before they left its boundaries, into an assembly of the whole tribe, is represented by the Psalmist as a going "from strength to strength", till all the tribes, as they pour in together from the north and from the south, and from the east and from the west, "appear", a holy nation, "in Zion before God." And it is even capable of being more spiritually and adequately satisfied under the Christian dispensation, if the various relations of domestic life be duly regarded by ministers and people in the public services of religion. Every true Christian of course prays alone,—"enters into his closet", and when he hath shut the door, addresseth to his Father, who heareth in secret, his individual acknowledgments, confessions, and desires. Many have exhibited the admirable pattern (we instance, with peculiar satisfaction, the late excellent Mr. de la Flechière, or Fletcher, of Madeley) of holding, at regularly returning hours, daily spiritual and intimate communion of worship with the partners of their life,—“they twain” thus becoming one spirit. To sustain the proper interest of this engagement, requires, it is evident, a very pure and steady flame of spiritual feeling. Then comes, what no Christian families can dispense with, without incalculable injury,—what is ordinarily termed domestic worship—the assembling of children, servants, dependants, and visitors, for prayer and instruction. At the top of all come congregational, (we use not the epithet here in its denominational signification,) or church communion, which appears to us then only adapted to its highest benefits, when all the preceding forms of spiritual feeling, or communion, pour ‘their glory and their honour into it.’ It receives its fulness from them.

In the distinction so beautifully drawn by Mr. Walford, (in his recent volume on the ‘Manner of Prayer,’ reviewed in our last Number,) between the *proper forms of expression* in public and in private devotion, especially in reference to confession, we entirely concur; and while the whole of the section extracted on that subject, may be fairly represented as important to all, and the distinction referred to is particularly instructive to those newly entering

on the duty of conducting public devotions, we beg to recommend the commencing paragraph afresh to the consideration of all our readers. The proper spirit of confession is there truly represented as consisting in a 'lowly sense of our guiltiness,' and as connected 'with a deep sensibility of the impossibility of justifying ourselves,' and an entire reliance upon the righteousness of God, which is 'revealed in the gospel.' How are these to be drawn out? So far as this depends upon the form, which was the point the excellent Author of that Treatise had particularly in view, it must be attempted, as he has justly said, by the leader of the worship making it his object, 'to feel deeply his own guiltiness, and to communicate a similar feeling to those whom he personates.' Yet he can do this with propriety only by 'general confessions of guiltiness': the sentiments expressed may be deep, the language pungent, but the confessions must be general. It is evident, then, that the expressions of the leader are but an organ of appeal to the minds of the congregation;—the essence of the worship is not in them, but in the sympathetic responses (these, however, not being general, but particular) of hearts drawn out in unison. How affecting, how powerful this lesson! It is not, then, the leader's words which are presented by Christ Jesus to the Father; nor is it the amen of the thoughtless, which constitutes them worshippers; but the particular and special utterance of the contrite heart is acceptable worship, and the ascending flame of sincere devotion, which is made up from the desires and the sighs of spirits earnestly engaged, and which is absorbed in and sanctified by the purity of His own intercession, constitutes the presentation of our great High-priest. Oh that these simple and important views may, on the one hand, tend to preserve younger ministers from falling into that magniloquence in prayer, against which Mr. Walford has so long affectionately remonstrated, and now again remonstrates; and on the other, make it clear to all our readers, that public worship, to attain its highest objects, must be fed with the materials, and fanned with the spirit of our private devotions!

What is thus true of the contributions of individual prayer, is equally so with regard to those of family prayer; and the principle already illustrated in reference to the former, will serve, we trust, the purpose we intended, when speaking of the advantage of families being placed together on public religious occasions. "We took sweet counsel together, and walked to the house of God in company," constituted in the view of David, as the remotest limit of contrast, so the most pathetic aggravation, to the treachery of his '*familiar* friends;' and he has thus exemplified the form in which intimate and endeared connection delights to express its purest and its deepest feelings. Those whose interest it is to be often together, will find that their highest interests are best promoted when they are, and feel themselves to be, together in the

noblest exercises of the soul ;—in other words, when their noblest faculties of understanding, reason, faith, desire and devotion, are drawn forth together. Mrs. Barbauld has, in her *Essay on Public Worship*, (which, however, we do not recommend as a satisfactory production on the subject,) spoken very beautifully of the power of sympathy in enlarging the flame of devotion. Let this idea be applied to the present case, and how much deeper than any general sympathy will be that which, on the same principle, pervades the hearts of intimate and endeared connections. But the case is clear enough. The father's heart, who, when he first taught his boy to pray by praying with him, knelt down with him, side by side, and, as his emotions rose, pressed him closer to his breast,—the mother's, who has watched the tear gathering and standing in her daughter's eye, under some close appeal of the divine word to her awakening conscience,—have long ago decided it. They are the parties most deeply interested in the question ; and they will affirm with us, that if public devotion derives any of its fulness from family sympathies, and the emotions which arise from the hearts of parents, children, brothers and sisters, have aught to do in feeding the bright flame of public prayer, then, to the production of this element in any adequate degree of enlargement and of force—"what God hath joined together, let not man put asunder."

Our readers will not have failed to notice, while perusing the last extract, how very different the order of prayer is in the Dutch Reformed Church from that which prevails among ourselves ; we mean the Congregational churches. The difference would seem to be in our favour, since their principal prayer is equally long with ours, and has the additional disadvantage of occurring when the attention has been already sufficiently exhausted by a sermon of considerable length. It is better, we think, that the sermon should follow, since the tendency to exhaustion, being of course greatest toward the close of the whole service, is in that case partly counteracted by the sitting posture. It is also more favourable to the carrying home of the instructions and impressions which have been received. But it would be certainly wrong in us to be satisfied with our own mode on account of its preferableness to any other, if, on the other hand, there be any existing or practicable modes preferable to them, or more conducive to the ends of worship. We are again referred by this reflection to some important suggestions of Mr. Walford, to which, with respectful deference to himself and the accomplished Reviewer, we will venture to append a few additional remarks. The suggestions are two, and both relate to the weariness which many feel in our public religious exercises ; the one, as it may proceed from the comparatively small active share in the service which is allotted to the congregation ; the other, as it may be occasioned by the felt

monotony and undue length of the principal prayer. The former suggestion occurs at the 186th page of Mr. Walford's work, and is reprinted in italics, in testimony of the Reviewer's sense of its importance, at page 219, *ante*: the latter may be found in page 199 of Mr. Walford's, and page 220 of the present volume.

The complaint of weariness is, we fear, in a great majority of instances, itself deserving of censure. In the times of our forefathers, when piety was less regardful of accommodations than at present, we apprehend this complaint was far less frequent. There is a prevailing habit of adjusting both mind and body to easy and susceptible postures in worship, which hardly comports with *active* devotion. Indeed, this seems too much abandoned to those who have gone before us. We appear to be satisfied with the activity of charity. Still we fully enter into the importance of the suggestion. We cannot control the habits of society, and while we bear their pressure, we must make particular allowance for the influence of the indulgent methods of medical treatment now in use. The sick must be considered, and especially those who are often the joy and crown and glory of our churches,—our infirm and aged members. Let then our worship, as it ought, be constructed not in too exclusive reference to the strong and healthy, but in conformity with the beautiful suggestions in Rom. xv. 1, Heb. iv. 15, v. 2, xii. 12, 13, Thess. v. 14,—on a principle of sympathetic adaptation to the infirmities of the brethren. In a word, let there be every thing to support and elevate the worshipper, nothing to weary, distract, or distress him.

But how may this be done? First, it has been suggested, that 'the responsive form of the litany is well adapted to maintain attention, by giving, as well to the congregation as to the officiating minister, an active part in the service;' secondly, and 'things remaining as they are as to the exclusive employment of 'extemporary prayer,' that 'a simple, but important improvement' might be made by the division of the principal prayer into two parts, or, in other words, by equalizing the length of the first two prayers, the former of which might immediately follow the commencing hymn, and be divided from the latter by another hymn and the reading of the Scripture.

The former change would certainly produce variety, and in its commencement, at least, would as certainly stimulate attention: how long this latter effect would continue, may perhaps admit of doubt. We are obliged to question the vivid interest of the majority of Episcopalians,—we mean serious Episcopalians, of course, else the comparison would not be fair—in their constantly recurring forms. Mr. Walford himself agrees, 'that the continued 'use of the same forms is likely to generate inattention,' and that, 'unless unremitting exertion be made to prevent it, the thoughts 'will wander during the recital of the well-known words, which

‘at length come to be repeated mechanically and without effort.’ Both sides of the case, therefore, it is evident, must be considered; and our own conviction is, that, so far as the weariness complained of is to be regarded as resulting from the mode, and not from indeliberateness in the worshipper, the advantage is in favour of free prayer. Yet are we conscious of many attractions in favour of the mode which Mr. Walford recommends. Independently of its supposed advantage in maintaining attention, by giving the congregation an active part in the service, we think the latter consideration itself, that of making the congregation as active as possible, exceedingly proper on its own account, and worthy of particular attention. Our principal care would be to see it *properly* done. It is, we take for granted, the *responsive form* of the Litany, (as expressed,) and not the matter of it, which Mr. Walford is inclined to recommend. We hardly think that he would advise such repetitions of invocation, such injudicious selection of supplications, such indiscriminate accumulation of pleas, or such unvaried sameness of introduction, with regard to the otherwise truly admirable intercessions, as the Litany presents, to be imitated in our worship. If, then, it be merely the *responsive form* which he recommends, we are happy to record our agreement; keeping in view, at the same time, the different character of the Episcopal and Congregational Churches, and the conditions necessary to its profitable introduction.

The worship of the Congregational churches is distinguished from that of the Episcopal, not only by its superior freedom from ancient prescription, but by the influence of reflection on its materials and modes. The Episcopal church, as the child of antiquity, the reformed daughter of the Roman or papal,—reformed, but still a daughter, retaining, to say the least, as much of the features of her parent as is consistent with her reformation,—has not only incorporated into her worship the most valuable existing remains of ancient devotion, but some that are more questionable; and has pressed into the service of Christian assemblies, without considering, or perhaps even seeing, their inapplicability to present times and general occasion, a large proportion of Scripture pieces which have exclusive reference to the Mosaic dispensation, or to individual circumstances. That we may not be chargeable with hastily ‘taking up a reproach’ against our brethren, we specify as an instance of questionable ancient forms, the Athanasian Creed;—as instances of Scripture pieces inapplicable to general worship, the songs of Mary, Zacharias, and Simeon,—called in ecclesiastical nomenclature, the ‘*Magnificat*,’ ‘*Benedictus*’ and ‘*Nunc dimittis*’;—and as form, the majority of which are exclusively Jewish, the Psalter as ‘appointed to be said or sung’ in alternate responses. These certainly exhibit the character of Episcopal worship as largely impregnated with

an indiscriminating spirit of adherence to ancient prescriptions. That of the Congregational churches, on the other hand,—which, as the adult offspring of Puritanism, may be said to have improved upon the lessons of their parent, by applying to the purifying of their constitution, that use of reason, and reference to Scripture, which she had mainly exemplified in relation to the forms of worship,—is *essentially and deeply reflective*; and while expressing our accordance with Mr. Walford and his Reviewer, in the probable benefit which these churches might receive, as well as the beautiful example of Christian amity they would exhibit, in applying to the episcopal ritual as a source of beneficial emendation to their own methods,—we feel assured that they will not withhold the sanction of their approbation from our suggestion, that whatever is adopted from the treasures of the Episcopal Church, must be selected and incorporated under the influence of that reflection which we have assumed to be the characteristic of Congregational worship. We have not declined to avail ourselves of the inspired treasures of the Jewish Church, being in the constant habit of using the Psalms and other scripture pieces, as professedly ‘applied to the Christian state and worship in the imitations of our Christian Psalmist, Dr. Watts: why then should we be loath to accept the contributions of the ancient Christian churches, by employing, in judicious combination with all that is valuable in our present usages, the compositions of our earlier Christian brethren? These, as exhibited in the service-book of the English Church, with which our readers will be better acquainted than with any other printed ritual, may be divided into two classes, the metrical and non-metrical; or, to speak more correctly, those which are adapted to be sung, and those which are adapted to be said. To the former is to be referred the ‘*Te Deum laudamus*’ ascribed to Ambrose, Archbishop of Milan, in the fourth century; the ‘*Gloria Patri*,” dating from shortly after the Nicene Council; and four brief responsive pieces of a very interesting character, all of which, with the exception of the ‘*Sursum Corda*’ which occurs only in the Communion Service, may be found in the orders of morning and evening service. The latter class comprises many of the Collects, (the greater parts are translations from the Latin,) the Creeds, and the beautiful prayer of St. Chrysostom. With respect to these latter, we must at once frankly declare our conviction, that to attempt their introduction into our service in the form in which they now exist, would, notwithstanding their great beauty, be extremely prejudicial and destructive to the connection and unity of our worship. They are admirable studies for the leaders of our worship, and contain numerous excellent petitions clothed in beautifully simple language, but we do not admire the effect of those perpetually recurring beginnings and

endings which result from the too frequent use of such brief forms. To those which are adapted to be sung, we will recur presently.

Let us now be permitted to express our sentiments in reference to the division of the principal prayer. Something very nearly resembling what Mr. Walford recommends, was adopted some years ago, as we have heard, by Dr. Henry Burder, and has been so more recently by Mr. Binney; in both instances, we have understood, to the general and great satisfaction of their congregations. Let these respective divisions of prayer, with the preceding and intervening hymns, preserve a discriminate character; (as is beyond all question the case in the instances above referred to;) and we entertain no doubt that the variety which they create, would tend greatly to remove the weariness which is complained of, and would communicate an impulse and a spring to the feelings of the worshipper. We had nevertheless, on first thoughts, our apprehensions in relation to this change. Its answering to expectation in the instances above mentioned, and in those referred to by the Reviewer of Mr. Walford's treatise, seemed to us no adequate security that it would do so in other instances. Placing out of consideration the well known ability of these ministers, it may be generally pleaded, that those who introduce a change will, as a matter of course, be more thoroughly imbued with its principles and reasons than those who take it up in imitation of them. They are usually, too, persons of thought and reflection, who, even if they adhered to an old method, would obviate much of the evil attending it. We therefore felt disposed to question how much of the advantage experienced was fairly to be ascribed to the change itself, how much to the reflective discrimination and sagacity of its producing and directing spirit. We had our fears too on another point. Conceiving that the due allotment of time and appropriation of subject to these divided prayers, with the correlative adaptation of the opening and intervening hymns, might require, in the varieties of public service which fall to the conduct of our ministers, a more than ordinary faculty of combination to give propriety and consistent unity to the entire service, we felt a doubt whether, upon some occasions, confusion, repetition, and even disgust might not ensue from it, instead of order, progression and variety. We are happy, however, to have thought ourselves through this difficulty. We still think, that unless the limits of the two prayers be accurately defined, it is easier to offer one prayer than two without repetition, and easier to make the hymns and Scripture lessons harmonize with one, than with two. But we are satisfied that a very easy as well as discriminate allotment of space and subject may be made; and thus our principal difficulty is removed.

Were we obliged to separate the two improvements suggested,

we should not hesitate to declare our decided preference of the latter. We should certainly object to any change which went to diminish the quantity of free prayer which is offered in our churches. We have stated the characteristic of our devotion to be *reflection*; and we believe it was the sound and proper feeling, not merely that the devotions of a congregation should be adapted to the expression of a certain general variety, but that all the parts of devotion, invocation, adoration, confession, pleading, supplication, intercession, thanksgiving, should be continually pervaded by that variety which would result from a wise and reflective consideration of the circumstances of a congregation, and those of the nation, the church, and the world,—which allotted so large a proportion of the time of worship to the suggestive utterances of that individual, who, of all the members of the congregation, is best adapted, from his studies and official functions, to observe, appreciate, and express them. In addition to this, we have such deep convictions of the important reflex bearing of free prayer on the mind of the officiating minister himself, and of its beneficial influence in promoting the spirituality of all his official services, that, were it merely on this account, we never could consent to any abandonment of our usual method, or any essential infringement upon it.

We hasten to conclude this long, but, we trust, not unimportant or uninteresting discussion, with a statement of such variations in our present methods, as, in reference to *both* of Mr. Walford's suggestions, we have thought, might *perhaps* be generally recommended with some prospect of advantage. We feel, however, by no means sanguine on the point, and merely throw them out for the consideration of our more experienced brethren.

We coincide with the suggestion, that the service should commence with singing; not, however, a direct hymn of praise, but a mutual exhortation to devotional engagement. This might be done in the form of a hymn, such as we have in common use, (a part of the 30th hymn in the 2d book of Dr. Watts, for instance,) in which several verses are repeated to the same tune, or, as we think might be even better, by singing select portions of Scripture, composed as chaunts or anthems. The 95th and five following Psalms may be referred to, as suitable specimens of what we mean, were the direct forms of address in verses 8 and 9 of the 97th Psalm, altered to the third person, and some verses of the 99th omitted, or changed for others. Those who are not favourable to opening the service with singing, might, instead of this, adopt the method of having the congregation called upon to engage in worship, by the minister giving utterance to three or four suitable verses of Scripture, selected and varied from

time to time according to his judgment. After either method might come a prayer, as has been recommended, occupying from ten to fifteen minutes. This would very properly be made to include, *Invocation*; our calling upon God under his revealed relations, and as clothed with his revealed perfections, and drawing near to Him as seated on a throne of grace, through Jesus Christ the Mediator, in the exercise of humility and faith; *confession* of our actual transgressions, the sinfulness of our hearts, the power, the deceitfulness of sin itself, our incurred condemnation, and natural ruin and helplessness; *renouncing our own selves*, ceasing from all claims founded on the notions of our personal righteousness, wisdom, or strength; *looking to Jesus*; blessing the Father for Him as his inestimably precious gift; referring to his merits and atoning sacrifice, visible in the marks which he still bears of it, even now that he is ascended up on high, where he appears as the Lamb that was slain; and *pleading there in prayer for the bestowment of the Holy Spirit*, for peace, for a sense of the Divine forgiveness and favour, the spirit of adoption, and liberty of heart in the service of God and engagements of devotion.

Here, we think, the first prayer might very suitably be closed, to be succeeded by a hymn of praise. Why not sometimes by the '*Te Deum Laudamus*', plainly composed for congregational use? We would have this invariably a *full hymn of direct praise*; and we believe that from the Christian poets of ancient and modern times, a sufficient variety of admirable compositions might be obtained. The '*Benedictus*', or song of Zacharias, with a very few alterations, would also do admirably here. Then, as has been suggested, let the reading of the Scriptures follow. After this, it is proposed that the second prayer should come; which, beginning with thanksgivings to God for all his mercies, and especially for the means of grace; would naturally suggest the propriety of prayer for a right use of these means, and a blessing upon them, and so form a suitable transition to the supplicatory and intercessory parts: this prayer might occupy from fifteen to twenty minutes. Then would follow, as usual, the hymn which precedes the sermon; immediately after which, and before the announcement of the text, it has been recommended by the Reviewer of Mr. Walford's work, that a brief prayer may be offered in exclusive reference to the engagement immediately in prospect.

Should any particularly desire the admission of responsive forms, which we have not contemplated in any part of the service as just described, we must own that we have found no compositions that seem to us suitable, unless it be the four brief pieces we have already referred to, of which three are to be found in the orders of morning and evening service, beginning re-

spectively, "O Lord, open thou our lips", "The Lord be with you", and "O Lord, shew thy mercy upon us"; and the fourth in the communion service, beginning, "Lift up your hearts". The third, however, beginning, "O Lord, shew thy mercy upon us", we should not like to use without some alterations or omissions, to render it more simple and consistent in its character. Our interest in these small pieces arises from three sources; the circumstances which gave rise to them, they being evidently, in their origin, brief ejaculations of the heart in preparation for more lengthened exercises of prayer; their adaptation to a similar purpose at the present day; and the fact, that they were very early set to most beautifully simple musical compositions, and were, with those compositions, carefully gathered by Luther and Melancthon from the old Popish service-books, and brought by them into the use of the Protestant churches. We have heard them most beautifully set and sung in Germany, and think them, as brief ejaculatory pieces, thrown in, as one may say, before prayer, on the invitation of the minister to offer it, very capable of elevating devotional feelings. Thus, the minister would merely say, 'let us pray', and give utterance in his natural voice to the first member of one of them, when the people would immediately respond in music: on his uttering the next member, they would respond again. We have no fear that this mixture of natural and musical recitation, unusual as it may seem, would have any bad effect, since both the congregation and the minister would address their Maker and each other, in the way to which they are respectively accustomed among us, and which, if we may venture an opinion, is by far the most proper. On the one hand, we do not like the appearance of any single person singing alone in public worship, as is done by the clergy of Saxony and Prussia, in their communion service; on the other, we have long been convinced by the representations of Dr. Pye Smith, in his sermon on the comparative advantages of forms and free prayer, (representations which he has again recently repeated in his Rejoinder to Dr. Lee,) that 'the speaking of two or more voices at the same time, cannot be any other than dissonant and grating, and, if the number be not extremely small, quite unintelligible. The only way of giving pleasing utterance to a plurality of voices, is to connect them by tune and measured time; that is, by assuming singing tones.' Should any one inquire why we have not found a place for the "*Gloria Patri*", and ask us if we have forgotten the interest connected with it, as probably a primitive form, altered to its present state during the early Arian controversy, in order to distinguish the orthodox congregations from the Arian;—we answer, no: we have not forgotten it, but have seen no place in which we could recommend it to be incorporated

into our service. One now occurs, but it necessitates another change, which we submit at the same time to our elder and wiser brethren. If the hymn usually sung after the sermon were postponed, as is done in all Presbyterian churches abroad, till the prayer had been offered, and immediately preceded the benediction, it might sometimes be used in its place. The interesting custom of the Presbyterian churches is, immediately after the sermon, to pray; as is also done in the Church of England, and as many of our own ministers would find very grateful to their feelings, since they could then express the desires of their hearts over their congregation, under the full mutual impressions of the addresses just closed. After this they arise, and sing usually the hymn, "Unto Him that loved us, &c.", from the Apocalypse; and the people still standing are dismissed, with an exhortation to remember the poor, (agreeably to 1 Cor. xvi. 2), and the benediction. The allusion just made to postures, gives us occasion to observe, that, on the supposition of any adoption of the above suggestions, we should think it more than merely suitable, that the first two hymns and the ejaculatory responses should be sung standing, and the prayers offered in a kneeling posture.

We cannot bring this long discussion to a close, without thanking Mr. Walford sincerely for the suggestions upon which we have so freely remarked, and indeed for his interesting volume altogether, our feelings in reference to which are entirely in unison with those expressed by his esteemed Reviewer. To the latter gentleman we owe a respectful apology for returning so soon to ground which he had opened: let this apology be, that he had not space for the reflections on which he would willingly have entered, and that we have imagined that the expression of views in perhaps considerable accordance with those which he would have expressed, might possibly furnish an inducement to him to speak again.

We are still indebted to our readers for a summary of the various causes by means of which neological sentiments have invaded more or less all the Protestant churches of Holland. In our next paper, with which we shall conclude this review, we will develop these as far as we understand them; and also give a view of the university system of theological education in that country.

Art. IV. *Athens and Attica*: Journal of a Residence there. By the Rev. Christopher Wordsworth, M.A., 8vo, pp. xii. 285. Plates. 3 Maps. Price 12s. London, 1836.

NOTHING, we allow, can be easier than to write about Greece: we are, in debater's phrase, 'free to confess,' that there exists abundant material for the discussion of that inexhaustible subject

in all possible tenses, past, present, and future. We are not, however, equally prompt to admit that it is at all an easy thing to write about Greece to the purpose. From the riddle-guesser who works at the hundred *questiones vexatæ* of her aboriginal history, to the nostrum-monger who offers his single remedy for the multiplied evils of her actual condition, or the busy idler who wanders without specific object amid her rich and varied scenery, our shelves yield under the weight of the increasing mass; and yet, how little of all this is available for the purposes of the student seeking for sound and durable information. A few men of earnest intention and vigorous mind, have understood their business, and done their tasking fairly; but how large the majority who have written octavos and quartos concerning the magnificent wreck that still bears the name of Greece, without casting a gleam of light upon its obscurities, or contributing a single suggestion towards the elucidation of its history. On the whole, we like best to meet with the memorandum-book of a traveller who, though perhaps no great practical antiquary, nor deeply skilled in matters of art, carries with him, through scenes of glorious memory, a rich and ready store of classical recollections, with feelings and partialities prompt to recal and apply them.

Such a journeyer is Mr. Wordsworth. Learned and loving learning, he has evidently derived a keen enjoyment from the opportunities afforded him of bringing into contact the mental and the material. Nothing in his volume has given us greater pleasure, than the critical skill which he has manifested in the application of poetic legends and historical traditions to the illustration of the interesting objects that surrounded him. If we have not found in his gratifying and instructive book, the professional science of Stuart, or the profound antiquarianism of Leake and Gell, we have at least followed the traces of an accomplished scholar, through regions not to be satisfactorily explored, but by the aid of thorough scholarship. Notwithstanding the strenuous efforts which have been made to obtain an accurate knowledge of the topography of Greece, in connection with its ancient history, much, very much yet remains to be done in this way, before we can arrive at secure and comprehensive conclusions. The combined processes of observation, recollection, reasoning, and feeling, called forth by these investigations, are strikingly exhibited in the following extract. Mr. Wordsworth has just crossed from Eubœa to the continent, by the bridge of the Euripus, and, full of Homer, Agamemnon, and the Grecian fleet, is keeping a sharp look-out for Aulis.

‘We ascend a high rugged hill which is on the right of our road, and on the western verge of a peninsula formed by two bays. At its summit there is a ruined Hellenic city, probably of the heroic age. Its huge polygonal walls remain in their complete circuit. The interior

of the city is strewed with broken pottery, and overgrown with wild plants. It is in an ancient city, like this, that the traveller feels, I might almost say, an emotion of gratitude, that the physical structure and inorganic elements of this country are such as they happen to be. Nature did well in forming Greece of hard imperishable limestone. For from this formation it results, that the monuments here of the most remote times, constructed with the native stone, with all the severity of age, combine the freshness of recent structure; thus appearing to appropriate the beholder to themselves, and not to be influenced by him. They exist not, it seems, in their (?) age; but he lives in theirs. Their share in to-day seems greater than his own.

‘This is illustrated by the character of the place which we are now in. We enter the gate of this ancient town. The towers which flanked the old gateway still stand, on your right and left. The groove of the gate, the socket which received its bar, seem to have been recently chiseled. Within the city at the N.W. a large square cistern is hewn in the living calcareous rock: its clean sharp sides seem to have been lately carved to receive a shower, which is expected soon to fall. You advance to the eastern wall: a flight of stone steps invites you to mount from the area of the city to a tower projecting from the wall, in order, you might almost fancy, that from its lofty eminence you might look down on the valley, the shore, and the Euripus now lying below you, and in order that you might thus assure yourself whether or no the Grecian fleet of Agamemnon was still lingering in the port of Aulis.’

The simple measure of throwing a bridge across the Euripus, and thus uniting the island of Eubœa with the continental territory of Bœotia, effected the most important political results. It interfered with the insular dominion of Athens, affected most injuriously her commerce, and neutralised her maritime superiority. The existence of such a communication, however, enabled Mr. Wordsworth to cross the strait much more to his convenience, than by the doubtful conveyance of a crazy ferry-boat. His first object was Aulis, of which we have just given the description, as applicable to its modern state. The road skirted the shore; and deep tracks worn in the rock, gave evidence of a time when these regions were tenanted by a dense and active commercial population. A short ride from the bridge brought Mr. W. to Aulis; and the ‘profusion of fictile fragments’ which he found in the area of the ancient city, may assist in its identification, since we learn from Pausanias, that, in its decay and desertion, its strong walls answered no other purpose than that of sheltering a few manufacturers of pottery. Leaving Delisi, the probable site of the ancient frontier fortress of Delium, and making a short excursion to the ruins of Tanagra, he beguiles the tedium of a somewhat dreary road from Aropus along the coast, to introduce a page or two of very ingenious verbal and topographical criticism,—more ingenious, we suspect, than certain. From Kalamo,

Mr. Wordsworth took the direction of Rhamnus and Marathon, anxious to explore the ruins of the temple of Nemesis, which gave sanctity to the former site, and to examine the natural and artificial features which still attest and illustrate the victory of Miltiades. Of the two temples which once stood conspicuous on the Rhamnusian promontory, the wreck alone remains; but the platform on which they stood, the vestiges of walls and foundations, with fragments of columns, and various portions of the structure, furnish the antiquary with sufficient details of a satisfactory restoration. In the 'Unedited Antiquities of Attica,' these are given with much skill, both of execution and explanation. Of the town itself, in its actual state, we cite the description.

'We leave the temples, and walk eastward down a narrow glen to the rocky peninsula on which the town of Rhamnus stood. Its remains are considerable. We enter the western gate, flanked by towers, and follow the line of the southern wall toward the sea. This wall is well preserved. It is about twenty feet in height: the part of the town which borders on the sea is rendered very strong by its position on the edge of high perpendicular rocks. Though not large, it was thus well-adapted to answer the purposes for which it was used, as one of the main maritime keys of Attica. The beauty of its site, and natural features, enhanced as it is by the interest attached to the spot, is the most striking characteristic of Rhamnus. Standing on this peninsular knoll, the site of the ancient city, among walls and towers grey with age, with the sea behind you, and Attica before, you look up a woody glen towards its termination in an elevated platform, where, as on a natural basement, the temples stood, of which even the ruined walls, of white shining marble, now show so fairly to the eye, through the veil of green shade that screens them.'

Marathon is next described. A dreary plain, extending for several miles along the shore, presents nothing whatever to attract the eye: neither hedge nor dwelling breaks its monotonous surface, and the few stunted pines or pear-trees which struggled through the marshy soil, shew but as in mockery of its barrenness.

'In this level solitary place, the eye is naturally arrested by one object, which raises itself above the surface of the plain more conspicuously than anything else. That object is the Tumulus which covers the ashes of those Athenians who fell in the battle of Marathon. It produces a sensation of awe, to find oneself alone with such an object as this. It was a wise design which buried these Athenians together under such a tomb, in the place on which they fell.'

Marathon and its vicinity seem to be in a not much more tranquil state at present, than they were during the Persian campaign: the difference lies simply between the foreign invader

and the native banditti. Outrages are continually committed. While Mr. W. was on the spot, the husband of his hostess was in the hands of the 'Klefts', retained until a heavy ransom should set him free. Our countryman himself was obliged to give up his intention of crossing Mount Pentelicus, the usual road from Marathon to Athens, since there was no chance of escape from the plunderers who infested the path. Even the lower and more circuitous route by the sea could only claim a comparative security; it was the '*safer*' way. Athens, however, was reached without accident; and the first glance gave melancholy illustration of the miseries of war. Houses shattered and roofless; public buildings stripped to the bare walls or levelled with the ground; 'planked sheds', offering a wretched substitute for the usually sumptuous bazar of the East. In the midst of this '*modern*' and paltry desolation, rise the majestic ruins of the ancient city of Minerva. The Acropolis, with the lofty wreck of the Parthenon and the picturesque fragments of the Erechtheum, rises impressively amid a chaos of broken walls and battered hovels. The temple of Theseus towers over a plain strewn with a common-place jumble of the mean and the miserable. Of this noble structure, in its present state, our readers will thank us for citing Mr. Wordsworth's brief description, to which we shall add his striking, though rather affectedly expressed, reflections on the actual condition of Athens compared with that of Rome.

'Such is the integrity of its structure, and the distinctness of its details, that it requires no description beyond that which a few glances might supply. Its beauty defies all; its solid yet graceful form is indeed admirable; and the loveliness of its colouring is such, that, from the rich mellow hue which the marble has now assumed, it looks as if it had been quarried, not from the bed of a rocky mountain, but from the golden light of an Athenian sunset.

* * * * *

'However melancholy may be the aspect of objects about us, it cannot but be felt that this very desolation itself has its value. It simplifies the picture. It makes an abstraction of all other features, and leaves the spectator alone with Antiquity. In this consists, particularly at the present period, the superiority of Athens over Rome, as a reflection of the ancient world. At Athens the ancient world is every thing; at Rome it is only a part, and a very small one, of a very great and varied whole. "*Romam sub Româ quærito*," said Aringhi, of the vast remains of the Imperial City which were to be found in the catacombs beneath it; the same expression may be repeated of ancient Rome generally; for ancient Rome is to be sought beneath the Rome of the middle ages, and still further beneath the Rome of the present day. How rarely therefore is it found! On the Quirinal hill, few people think of the legend of Quirinus, while the Palazzo Quirinale

dazzles them with its splendour. If we may use the illustration, the ancient characters impressed on the Roman soil, can only be described with great labour through the modern surface of the illuminated missal of papal splendour which has been superscribed over them. Athens, on the other hand, though a very tattered manuscript, is not yet, like Rome, a Palimpsest.'

Notwithstanding all this, however, much has been recently brought to light, even at Athens, by the vulgar operations of the pickaxe and the spade. The soil of the Acropolis has been partially removed to a considerable depth, and valuable discoveries have rewarded the enterprise. Remains of Turkish and Venetian engineering have been removed, and the foundations of the Parthenon made visible. Relievos, works in bronze and terracotta, painted figures and heads, capitals and friezes coloured with bright hues of blue and red, were turned up during the process, and the temple of Victory without wings has been uncovered and restored. The subterranean passage which led from the grotto of Aglauros to the temple of Minerva Polias, has been discovered; and altogether we seem in a fair way to know as much of Athens as can be ascertained by an energetic and skilful system of exploration.

Thus much may suffice as a general indication of the character and contents of this interesting volume, which contains a fair proportion of valuable illustration, even of subjects that have been examined and discussed by Stuart and Leake. We cannot, however, think the book improved by the political allusions which occasionally *creep out*, and seem to indicate that the Author belongs to the one-sided school of Mitford and Mitchell. One of these is, if we read its import aright, especially absurd. Mr. Wordsworth, in a Macedon-and-Monmouth sort of comparison between the Athenian Acropolis and the Prussian fortress of Ehrenbreitstein, speaks of the latter as the 'representation' of the 'chivalrous and Christian.' It is just possible that the allusion here may be to some legend of by-gone days; but we can only take it as a reference to the more recent period when Coblenz was the rallying point of the French *noblesse*. We can have no objection, certainly, except on the score of taste, to this transformation of the Count d'Artois into a Paladin, and his associates into the chivalry of Christian faith and morals; we may, however, just intimate our own conviction, that all such comparisons are, as Mrs. Slipslop says, 'odorous';—that, if the Revolution destroyed the French monarchy, the Emigration betrayed it;—and that, if no other proof were tangible, of the bad feeling and obstinate bigotry of these *preux chevaliers*, it would be irrefragable in their treatment of the consistent and high-minded Cazalés.

Art. V. *Jireh*; a Scene in the Pastoral Life of the Author. 8vo, pp. 156. London, 1836.

“FROM the sublime to the ridiculous there is but a step.” So said Napoleon. This axiom of life is a canon of criticism, and we leave our readers to apply it according to the mood in which they conclude the perusal of the following passage with which the Author of *Jireh* introduces his narrative. If they feel in unison with the Writer, they will read and read on with indescribable emotions to the end. If, on the contrary, they are not of a very excitable temperament, and have little taste for a transport, an ecstasy, or a flood of glory, we are afraid that the specimen we have given will not prove very alluring, except to their curiosity, and that, we may venture to say, will be fully gratified.

‘ I awoke on a bright September morning, as the rays of the horizontal sun entered my chamber, and undrew my eye-lids ; their orient glory too conveyed not only light but language, as they broke simultaneously and with irrepressible force upon my soul the never-to-be-forgotten, although unarticulated, strains,—

“ Bright like a sun the Saviour sits,
And spreads eternal noon.”

‘ This was no dream ; it was Nature labouring, as often she does by splendid phenomena, to incite the grovelling creature man to meditation. It was a transport ; an ecstasy ; a flood of glory, which the suns of nature and of righteousness, in a confluence of strength and beauty, produced, as by an irruption, in my soul. I started not,—I spoke not ; but surrendered my whole spirit, powers, and passions, to a kind of blissful absorption. There was the absence of all bodily and secular disquietude. I dilated, as though unincumbered of frailty, in one expansive thought ; and if the resemblance to a wish lingered upon my spirit, it was only that I might add perpetuity to the scene, or steal away to those shining ones, whose “ sun shall no more go down.” But it was otherwise intended, and I afterwards learned, that this excellent glory was not dispensed to prepare me for the rest of heaven, but for the labours of earth ; to constitute a memento for pleasing retrospect in my hours of darkness, which, during a life eventful and complex, have indeed been many.

‘ Long did these sentiments and scenes so vivid, continue to crowd my mind. All truth seemed luminous ; and, without the aid of any sportive imagination, appeared to strike, as from an orb of glory, its radiant beams into the waiting expanse.’ pp. 1, 2.

Art. VI. *A Residence at Constantinople*, during a Period including the Commencement, Progress, and Termination of the Greek and Turkish Revolutions: By the Rev. R. Walsh, LL.D. Author of "A Journey from Constantinople," "Notices of Brazil," &c. &c. Two Volumes 8vo. (Plates). London, 1836.

THE previous works of this very agreeable and singularly well informed Writer*, will have prepared the Public to expect much more from these volumes, than is to be obtained from the slightly constructed Journals of ordinary travellers paying a hasty visit to the shores of the Levant. Dr. Walsh resided for several years at Constantinople in the capacity of Chaplain to the British Embassy; and after an interval of six years, during which he visited the Western Hemisphere, he returned to the Ottoman capital, where he found that material changes had taken place. He had thus opportunities, such as few have enjoyed, of seeing the East under different aspects; 'its quiescent state before the 'revolutionary struggle began, the agitation which ensued during 'its progress, and the alterations which took place when it was 'finally past.' The materials of these Volumes have been supplied by the Author's letters to friends at home, written under the fresh impression of the scenes and events described; but those impressions were frequently corrected by subsequent experience; and in the narrative formed out of the substance of the original letters, the reader will find some variations of opinion, the result of seeing the same things under new aspects. This is a rare advantage, which few travellers can enjoy.

At the present moment, Constantinople, the grave of the Byzantine empire, as it seems likely to be of the Califate, and the scene of one of the most singular revolutions that has ever been attempted,—a transition still in progress,—this Asia in Europe, where the magnificent semi-barbarism of the middle age is wrestling with the omnipotent knowledge of the new era,—forms unquestionably the most remarkable and interesting spot upon which our observation can be fixed. 'I longed,' says Dr. Walsh, describing his own feelings on setting out for the Levant, 'to see 'Hunkiar, the Manslayer, who is still allowed, as a recreation, to 'kill fifty of his subjects a-day peremptorily, and as many more 'as he can show cause for; who permits his rayas (subjects) of 'his great bounty, to wear their heads for another year, when 'they pay the capitation-tax; who suffers the representatives of 'his brother sovereigns to be dragged into his presence only when 'his slaves have fed, clothed, and washed them till they are fit to

* For a review of Dr. Walsh's Journey from Constantinople, see Ecl. Rev. 2d Ser. Vol. XXX. p. 84. Do. of Dr. Walsh's Notices of Brazil, Ecl. Rev. 3d Ser. Vol. III. p. 546.

'be seen; who proscribes, as impious, every book but the Koran'; and inhibits the use of any language but the Turkish; and who puts to death, with unsparing ferocity, every audacious man who presumes to enlighten the venerable ignorance of his subjects.' That such a nation as the subjects of this barbarian power should actually exist in Europe in the nineteenth century, is a curious phenomenon.

'Nothing, perhaps,' observes our Author, 'marks the extraordinary nature of the Turkish Government more than that its head is actually called *Hun-Kair*, or the Man-killer; and the exercise of his prerogative in destroying his subjects is his distinguishing appellation; and such is the profound veneration for the life of him who thus takes the life of others, that, in all the bloody changes that have taken place, and in all the deluges of human blood that have been shed, there is no instance of a private person raised to the Ottoman throne, or the blood-stained line of Turkish dynasty broken. It is from this feeling of veneration that the Sultan has absolute power, in certain cases, over the property as well as the lives of his subjects; and the possessions of all who die without heirs, or in public employments, fall of right to the Sultan. He is the source of all honours, and the concentration of all dignity. No Turk can be heir to an hereditary distinction but himself; and while a purely republican equality exists among the people, the sovereign is the whole body of an aristocracy in his own person. The Sultan, as successor of the Prophet, is head of his Church, and exercises supreme dominion over it; and hence magistrates whose power is delegated by him, have power over the inferior priesthood, as Christian bishops over their diocesan clergy; and as the secular and temporal power are united in the same body, these magistrates may officiate as priests.' Vol. II. pp. 451-3.

In many of these features of the Ottoman despotism, there will be recognised a very close resemblance to the theory of the royal power and prerogative in the English constitution; and in the days of the Eighth Henry, the practice was not very far behind the theory. We may remark too, that hereditary distinction, considered as a grant from the Crown, will appear from the above account to be in fact a much more important concession in itself than it is generally considered; for, while it seems opposed only to a republican equality, it is not less a restriction upon the prerogative. In the Ottoman Sultan, the political doctrine of Divine right is illustrated to perfection, and the alliance of Church and State is as complete as our Tory divines could desire. Now it is not to be denied, that "the powers that be are ordained of God;" or that the Man-slayer is as legitimate a power as any Christian sovereign. Nevertheless one may be allowed to suppose that, albeit Government is in itself a Divine appointment, the Turkish *form* of Government is not of Divine authority, and though suf-

ferred to exist during so many centuries, it is far from being any more than the tyranny of Nero or Domitian, conformable to the will of the Supreme Ruler. A reform of such a political system might seem, however, to be hopeless ; and one could have looked only to see the decrepid despotism, when its energies were fairly exhausted, crumble to dust. But, surprising to tell, Sultan Mahmoud has taken upon himself the task of achieving political reforms, which none of his subjects could have ventured to attempt, or been able to accomplish ;—radical reforms, compared to which, all our reform-bills and the boldest innovations dreamed of by our most ultra-liberals are but trifles. He has undertaken to revolutionize the manners and the mind of an entire nation ; and since the days of Peter the Great, no monarch has ever succeeded in producing, by the beneficent exertion of despotic power, so extraordinary a change in the aspect of society.

When Dr. Walsh left Constantinople for the first time, in 1825, it was 'immersed in darkness and ferocity.' On his return, he found it 'the abode of an improving population.' Three important events had taken place in the interval. The Russians had crossed the Balcan, and threatened the Ottoman capital, but, withheld from advancing by reasons unexplained, had suddenly retraced their steps. The Janissaries had been extirpated. The Levant Company had been extinguished. To which we may add, as a circumstance not less material than the last, an American envoy had been received by the Porte, and added to the diplomatists at Pera. Nor were these the only changes. The first thing that struck the Author on landing at Tophana, on his second visit, was the absence of those packs of dogs which used to form the 'sacred nuisance of the suburbs, and which were 'the great engines of annoyance when a Mussulman wished to 'attack a Giaour' (unbeliever). The expulsion of these hateful animals, he learned, was one of the Sultan's first reformatations, but one which even *he* would not have dared attempt, before he had removed 'the great barrier to improvement, the Janissaries.' An immense number were destroyed by poison ; and when the Turks began to murmur at the cruel destruction of their favourite scavengers, the order was given, to transport the survivors, with their whelps, across the Bosphorus to Scutari. Now that the dogs had disappeared, 'by a metamorphosis altogether incredible 'in Turkey, pigs had begun to supply their place.' During the whole of his former sojourn in Turkey, Dr. Walsh says, he never saw one of these proscribed animals. Now, the first sound he heard, on visiting Therapia, was the grunting of one ; and on the high grounds above the town, he met a whole herd of swine. He further found that pork was as publicly sold as mutton.

'The Turks, having conquered their first repugnance to the sight of this unclean animal, soon began to relax in their taste. When it was exposed for sale, many purchased it for food, without affecting to know or mark the difference between it and mutton ; and in this the upper classes set the example. At an entertainment given at the French palace, several Turks of rank were present, and a friend of mine saw two of them very busy regaling themselves with some ham. Supposing they did not know, in that disguised form, the animal to which it belonged, he made it a scruple of conscience to tell them that they were eating the flesh of an unclean animal. They only replied, with great good humour, that it was a pity such good food should ever be thought unclean or prohibited ; and they went on eating till they were satisfied. You may think this a trifle scarcely worth noticing among the revolutionary events of Turkey ; but, if you consider it as casting down one of the great barriers which prejudice, and that prejudice a religious one, had set up to prevent the Mahomedan from amalgamating with the Christian people of Europe, it is of much importance But the most marked change in their domestic usages was, their beginning to drink wine.' Vol. II. p. 272.

The Sultan has himself adopted the use of wine at his table, as one of the European customs to which he has made so close approximation ; and is particularly fond of champagne. His ministers follow his example ; and the practice is becoming general. Among other not less remarkable changes which attracted Dr. Walsh's notice, he mentions the parading of the soldiers, dressed in uniform, while regimental bands were playing European tunes remarkably well. The adoption of the English instead of the Turkish saddle, is another bold imperial innovation. Regardless of suffering and personal risk, the Sultan set the example of learning to ride upon a horse without any saddle ; and he has not only made himself, by dauntless perseverance, an admirable European horseman, but has inspired his Oriental subjects with a strong desire to imitate him. But the most extraordinary innovation on Turkish ignorance and prejudice was the establishment of an Ottoman Gazette !

'On the 13th of October, 1831, a prospectus of the intended newspaper was issued, printed both in French and in Turkish. It stated, "that it was the sincere desire of the Sultan to assure the public tranquillity, and deliver his people from those suspicions and vain fears which false reports and idle speculations always engender ; that ignorance was the cause of distrust and opposition, for men were ever disposed to set themselves against that of whose cause or object they were not informed, and ready to attribute measures to motives entirely different from those which actuated the Government." After this extraordinary and most unexpected concession to public opinion, it goes on to state, that a conference had been held to take the matter into consideration, and that it was determined that the people should be henceforth informed, in a prompt and efficient manner, of all cir-

cumstances, domestic and foreign, which related to the Turkish Government; and the political communications should be accompanied by whatever intelligence could enlighten the public mind, new inventions, commercial transactions, and all other objects of public utility.'

Vol. II. p. 281.

Hitherto, all the Turkish edicts and placards had been published in manuscript; and it was at first expected, that the new Gazette would appear in that form. But the Ottoman world was now to behold new wonders. A printing office was established in the neighbourhood of the Seraskier's palace*, expressly and exclusively for the newspaper; and a learned *mollah* of Mecca, the historian and poet laureate of the empire, was appointed to superintend the establishment. All the political news is transmitted to him daily by the ministers of the Porte, and all military details by the Seraskier; the head editor being no other than the Sultan himself!

'On Saturday the 5th of November, 1831, this phenomenon, called Taakvimi Veekai, or the "Tablet of Events," first appeared in the Turkish capital, and has ever since been regularly published. In order to give it more extensive circulation, every pasha in the empire is obliged to subscribe for a certain number of copies for the information of the people of his pashalik, among whom they are distributed. It is printed in two folio sheets, in Turkish and in French; the latter is called the "Moniteur Oriental." The one is read by the natives and rayas, and the other by the Franks. It is issued with great exactness, and every Saturday morning it is sent up with our breakfast as regularly as a weekly paper in London. The Sultan takes great interest in it, reads it regularly, and is himself a contributor to it, writing sometimes the leading article.

'The contents of the paper are usually as follow:—They commence with Constantinople, and the concerns of the Turkish empire. The principal details are those of the army and navy, their movements and the change of officers, with bulletins of actions by land or sea, fairly given, without much pompous orientalism. Then follow civil affairs, events of the provinces, with always a favourable view of things, and an eulogium on the Sultan's measures for the good of the people. Then succeed news of other countries, with sometimes extracts from the debates of the French Chamber of Deputies and the English Parliament, in which latter Mr. O'Connell cuts a conspicuous figure.

* Sultan Achmet III. had attempted the establishment of a printing press; but the introduction of printing was so violently opposed by the Ulema and the copiers of manuscripts, that his Armenian printers were obliged to desist, and the buildings were converted to other purposes. Sultan Selim erected a large edifice at Scutari for the same purpose, and competent persons were appointed to superintend the establishment. At this imperial press, forty works were produced in twelve years. Dr. Walsh has given a list of thirty-nine, which comes up to July 1822.

One could hardly imagine that violent democratic language would be permitted in a Turkish paper ; as yet, however, it is harmless, for the people do not understand it. But the most extraordinary communication is a kind of budget, in which the receipts of public money are given, the expenditure accounted for, with an accuracy of detail in piastres and paras, that would please Mr. Hume. This is a thing before unheard of in Turkish policy, where public money was a mystery, and everything concerning it kept secret, both in its collection and expenditure. These subjects are varied with accounts of useful inventions, elementary sketches of the arts and sciences, and sometimes pleasing and instructive stories.

'The Turks, when this newspaper first appeared, had no conception of any amusement to be derived from such a thing ; but, like children, when their curiosity was once excited, it knew no bounds. The publication of the news of the empire in this way soon became of universal attraction. The paper made its way to the coffeehouses, and the same Turk that I had noticed before dozing, half stupified with coffee and tobacco, I now saw actually awake, with the paper in his hand, eagerly spelling out the news. But the most usual mode of communicating it are news-rooms, and a place is taken where those who wish to hear it assemble. A stool is placed in the centre, on which the man who can read sits, and others form a circle round him and listen. The attention paid is very different from that which I saw them give to a storyteller. There was no mirth or laughter excited, but all seemed to listen with profound attention, interrupted only sometimes by a grave ejaculation of "Inshallah," or "Allah Keerim." The first thing a Turk of any consequence is anxious to know is, whether he has been mentioned, and what is said of him, and in this he shows a sensitiveness even superior to a Londoner or a Parisian, because, as the Sultan is the virtual editor, his opinion of a man is of some importance.

'The rayas of the empire soon caught the spirit of such a publication, and were delighted with the permission to imitate it. The Greek Patriarch I found was my venerable friend the Archbishop of Mount Sinai, whom I had left at his Patmos in the island of Antigone, expecting every moment to be led from thence to execution. By one of those sudden and common transitions of fortune in the East, he was taken from his obscurity and placed on the Patriarchal throne, where he sat when I visited him on my arrival, and found him no ways altered in simplicity of manners or kindness of disposition. As he was a man of letters, and anxious to promote literature in any way, he gladly entered upon the undertaking, and addressed a circular to the clergy and laity of the orthodox church on the subject, stating that a journal calculated to ameliorate and improve the social condition had already appeared in the capital, putting it in the power of every man to acquaint himself accurately with passing events, and that the Sultan had permitted to the Greeks the same indulgence. This was followed by a similar address from the Armenian Patriarch ; and in a short time four journals appeared every week in the capital from the different nations which compose its population, Turks, Greeks, Armenians, and Franks, written in their respective languages.'

But the most important and extraordinary revolution which had taken place since the Author's former visit, is that which appears to have been effected in the Sultan himself. To what this moral regeneration is to be ascribed, we are not told. It is certainly a change which would seem to indicate the operation of no ordinary influence. The statements of Dr. Walsh place the character of this extraordinary Mussulman in quite a new and most interesting light.

[*To be concluded in our next.*]

Art. VII. *The Family Expositor*; or a Paraphrase and Version of the New Testament, with Critical Notes, and a practical Improvement of each Section. By P. Doddridge, D.D. In six volumes. Price 1*l.* 7*s.* in cloth. London.

A CHEAP and excellently printed edition of Doddridge's *Family Expositor*; a work which needs no panegyric from us; but we owe an apology to the spirited Publisher for having overlooked this laudable attempt to promote its circulation by issuing it in volumes, which vie in cheapness with our Penny literature. The Critical Notes are omitted, as not being necessary for the domestic instruction for which the work is principally adapted.

ART. VIII. WORKS RECENTLY PUBLISHED.

EDUCATION.

The Figures of Euclid, with Questions.
By Rev. J. Edwards, M.A. 3*s.*
Select Orations of Cicero, with Notes
by A. Newland, B.A. 2*s.* 6*d.*

England; and exhibiting every material
Argument hitherto advanced for and against
Political Establishments of Christianity.
By the Rev. W. Thorn, Winchester.
In Turkey cloth, 7*s.* 6*d.*

HISTORY.

A Popular History of the Protestant
Reformation. By Thomas Fox. Fools-
cap 8vo, 3*s.* 6*d.*

MISCELLANEOUS.

The Book of Shells. 1*s.* 6*d.*
The Union of Church and State, Anti-
scriptural and Indefensible: including a
Particular Review of Chancellor Dealtry's
"Sermons," and of Archdeacon Hoare's
"Charge," in Defence of the Church of

THEOLOGY.

Divine Inspiration, or the Supernatural
Influence exerted in the Communication of
Divine Truth, and its special bearing on
the Composition of the Sacred Scriptures,
with Notes and Illustrations. By the Rev.
E. Henderson, LL.D., &c. (Being
the Fourth series of the Congregational
Lecture.)

Discourses on the Grand Subjects of
the Gospel, chiefly designed for Villages
and Families. By William Oram, Wal-
lingford.